DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 365 166 FL 021 800

AUTHOR Clair, Nancy
TITLE Beliefs, Self-Reported Practices and Professional Development Needs of Three Classroom Teachers with Language-Minority Students.
PUB DATE Feb 93
NOTE 263p.; Ed.D. Dissertation, Teacher's College, Columbia University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beliefs; Case Studies; Classroom Techniques; Educational Needs; Elementary School Students; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Grade 4; Grade 5; Grade 10; *Language Attitudes; Language Proficiency; *Limited English Speaking; Mainstreaming; Secondary School Students; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Education; *Teacher Expectations of Students; *Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Language Minorities

ABSTRACT

This study explored beliefs, self-reported practices, and professional development needs of three mainstream classroom teachers with language-minority students. Case histories of the teachers were composed from transcripts of interviews, classroom observation, and entries from teacher and observer journals. Analysis reveals that: (1) teacher beliefs about language-minority students may be based on hearsay and misinformation; (2) the teachers do not vary their planning but frequently vary lesson implementation; (3) choice of instructional practices may be based on naive notions of language proficiency and the demands of the mainstream classroom; and (4) teachers draw on intuitive wisdom because of lack of preservice teacher preparation and nonexistent or inadequate inservice education on issues related to language-minority students. Implications are drawn primarily for preservice and inservice teacher education: teacher educators must embrace a conception of schooling that considers the social, political, and cultural realities of a diverse student population when creating innovative curricula; inservice staff development regarding language-minority student issues should be context-specific, driven by the needs and commitments of teachers and the resources of school and community; teachers have a responsibility for engaging in dialogue with teachers, parents, and administrators about these issues; and more research is needed. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 365 166

BELIEFS, SELF-REPORTED PRACTICES AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS OF THREE CLASSROOM TEACHERS WITH LANGUAGE-MINORITY STUDENTS

by

Nancy Clair

Dissertation Committee:

Professor Karen Kepler Zumwalt, Sponsor
Professor Leslie Beebe

Approved by the Committee on the Degree of the Doctor of Education

Date FEB. 1993

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education in
Teachers College, Columbia University

1993

FL021800

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Clair

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

BELIEFS, SELF-REPORTED PRACTICES AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS OF THREE CLASSROOM TEACHERS WITH LANGUAGE-MINORITY STUDENTS

Nancy Clair

An increasing number of language-minority students spend only a portion of their day in the English as a Second Language (ESL) or bilingual classroom because of social, political, pedagogical and economic factors. The rest of their day is spent in the regular classroom, yet classroom teachers are generally not prepared to integrate these students (Wong-Fillmore and Meyer, 1992; Scarcella, 1990; Penfield, 1987). This qualitative study explores the beliefs, self-reported practices and professional development needs of three classroom teachers (grades 4, 5 and 10) with language-minority students.

Case histories of the teachers were composed from transcripts of in-depth interviews, notes from classroom observations and entries from teachers' and researcher journals. The analysis reveals that: (a) the teachers' beliefs towards language-minority students may be based on hearsay and misinformation; (b) the teachers do not vary their planning, but frequently vary lesson implementation; (c) selection of instructional practices may be based on naive notions of language proficiency and the demands of the mainstream classroom; (d) the teachers draw on intuitive wisdom because of a lack of preservice teacher preparation and nonexistent or ineffective inservice staff development regarding issues related to language-minority students.

The implications, targeted to teacher educators, staff developers, teachers and administrators, focus on preservice and inservice teacher preparation, because it is through education that beliefs and instructional practices may be treated. First, teacher educators need to embrace a more critical conception of schooling which considers the social, political and cultural realities of a diverse student population, when creating innovative preservice curricular designs. Second, inservice staff development regarding language-minority student issues should be context-specific; driven by the needs and commitments of the teachers and the resources of the school and

community. Third, teachers have implicit responsibilities to engage in dialogue, raise issues and collaborate with other teachers, parents and administrators about the education of language-minority students. Finally, more research focusing on teacher beliefs and behavior, innovative preservice teacher education and inservice staff development models is needed.

© Copyright Nancy Clair 1993

All Rights Reserved

To my mother and father
with
love, respect and admiration

and

To my dear aunt Sue
whose warmth, grace, friendship and love
are eternal

Acknowledgments

There are many people who provided invaluable support during the "dissertation years." First, I am indebted to my sponsor, Prof. Karen Kepler Zumwalt, for her guidance and support. Prof. Zumwalt's depth of understanding of teachers, schools and educational research was essential to the study. I am equally indebted to my other committee member, Prof. Leslie Beebe, whose probes into aspects of second language acquisition aided the analysis. Prof. Zumwalt and Prof. Beebe's individual expertise combined well. They were challenging to work with.

I am grateful to my dissertation group: Michele Reich, Sabrina King and Jennifer Robinson. Without their friendship, intellectual and emotional support and availability, I would probably still be writing the proposal.

This study could not have been realized if it were not for the three teacher informants. They were generous with their time and honest in their responses.

I want to thank Larry Callahan for his ever-patient responses to my numerous computer questions. Moreover, I am grateful to Classic Restorations, Inc. for their computer support.

I give thanks to all my friends for their understanding, especially since there were many times when my dissertation came first. Finally, I cannot find the words to express my feelings for my family. Thank you Mom, Dad, Ellen, Frank, Katie and Michael for your patience and love.

Table of Contents

Copyright 2

Dedication 3

Acknowledgments 4

Table of Contents 5

Chapter I Introduction 8
Background 9
Rationale 11
Assumptions 11
Significance 13

Chapter II Review of the Literature 15
Programs and Alternatives for Language-Minority Students 16
Submersion 17
English as a Second Language (ESL) 22
Content-based ESL 23
Bilingual 25
Bilingual immersion 27
Bilingual two-way 28
Summary 29
Teacher Beliefs 30
Summary 35
Teacher Expectations 36
Teacher Expectations and Linguistic Variation 37
Teacher Expectations and Cultural Diversity 40
Summary 43
Teacher Efficacy 44
Summary 47
Mainstreaming Research 48
Summary 52
Related Research 53
Summary 55

Chapter III Method 56
Research Design 56
Participant Selection 57
Data Collection 59
Pilot Study 59
Interviews, Observations and Journals 62
Transcription Process 63
Writing the Case Histories 63
Validity and Reliability 63
Analysis of the Cases 65
Limitations of the Study 66

Chapter IV Narrative Case Studies 68
Anita 68
Current Teaching Context 70
Language-Minority Students 79
Luz 79
Rosa 85
Self-Reported Instructional Practices 92
Professional Development and Support 96
Joshua 101
Current Teaching Context 104
Language-Minority Students 108
Self-Reported Instructional Practices 116
Professional Development and Support 122
Laura 127
Current Teaching Context 131
Language-Minority Students 138
Ting-Ting 138
Fan 140
Chung-Hua 142
Jia-Ming 143
Self-Reported Instructional Practices 148
Professional Development and Support 153

Chapter V Cross-Case Analysis and Discussion 157
Personal and Professional Background 157
Current Teaching Context 159
Time Constraints 162
Curricular and Content Restrictions 163
School Environment and Support 164
Anita: Conflict and Tension 166
Joshua: Personal Experience and Self-Reliance 167
Laura: The Induction Year 168
Summary 169
Beliefs 169
Language-Minority Students 170
Knowledge of language-minority students 170
Beliefs about academic and social success 172
Beliefs about culture 176
Language-minority students' relation with peers . . 178
Teacher efficacy 179
Programmatic Approach 181
Descriptions of programmatic approaches. 182
Understanding of programmatic approaches. 183
Communication with the ESL and bilingual staff . . . 186
Stigma associated with being a student in an ESL or bilingual program 187
Individual Themes 188
Anita: conflict and conformity 188
Joshua: self-reliance and individualism 189
Laura: the induction year 190
Lexical Choice 190
Summary 191

Self-Reported Instructional Practices 193
Teacher Efficacy 198
Notions of Language Proficiency 200
Summary 204
Professional Development and Support 206
Administrative Support 207
Communication 208
Preservice Teacher Education 209
Inservice Teacher Development 210
Resources 213
Teacher Responsibilities 213
Summary 214

Chapter VI Conclusions and Implications 217
Conclusions 217
Implications for Practice 218
Teacher Educators and Preservice Teacher Preparation . . . 218
New directions 220
ESL/Bilingual Teacher Educators and ESL/Bilingual Preservice Teacher Preparation 225
Current practices 225
Staff Developers and Inservice Teacher Development 228
Teachers 234
Implications for Research 235
A Critique 235
Future Research 237
Teacher beliefs 237
Teacher knowledge 238
Teacher development 238
Concluding Thoughts 239

References 240
Appendix A Teacher Letter 253
Appendix B Screening Instrument 254
Appendix C Questionnaire: Interviews 1 through 4 255
Appendix D Questionnaire: Interview 5 258
Appendix E Interview Questions as Related to Research Questions . . . 259
Appendix F Consent Form 260

Chapter I

Introduction

Recent estimates suggest that by the year 2000 the language-minority student population will increase at two and a half times the rate of the general student population (U.S. Congressional Record, 1989). At present, there is a variety of programs each assuming views of language policy, teaching and learning for language-minority students. But because of social, political, pedagogical and economic factors, an increasing number of language-minority students spend only a small portion of their day in the English as a second language (ESL) or bilingual classroom. The rest of their day is spent in the regular classroom, yet mainstream teachers are not prepared to integrate these students (Wong-Fillmore and Meyer, 1992; Scarcella, 1990; Penfield, 1987). To date, second language research has virtually ignored the mainstream teacher. Given the fact that approximately 30% of all language-minority students are in the regular classroom (Lara, Minch and Hoffman, 1990), this study explores the beliefs, self-reported practices and professional development needs of three classroom teachers as they share in the education of these students.

Emerging from a synthesis of the literature and the researcher's personal experience as a teacher and teacher educator, three research questions provide the basis for this inquiry. They are:

1) What are three mainstream teachers' beliefs about language-minority students in the regular classroom?

2) What educational practices do the mainstream teachers say they use with language-minority students and how do they rationalize their choices?

3) How do the mainstream teachers perceive their professional development needs, roles, and responsibilities in the education of language-minority students?

Case histories of the three teacher informants were composed from transcripts of in-depth interviews, notes from classroom observations, and entries from teacher and researcher journals. The case histories were then compared and contrasted through a cross-case analysis and related to the literature. Information gathered from this study is targeted to educators committed to providing quality education for language-minority students, regardless of what educational services are available.

Background

The impact of the current third wave of immigration, dominated by Latino, Asian and Caribbean people is reflected in the cultural and linguistic diversity of public school students in the United States. Specifically, the language-minority population constitutes at least 20% of all students nationwide (U.S. Congressional Record, 1989). And in many urban areas that figure is doubled. In New York City, for example, more than 40% of youngsters in full-day kindergarten come from homes where a language other than English is spoken (Willner, 1985).

As the language-minority student population increases in urban America, the overall minority teaching pool decreases. It is estimated that "by the 21st century 40% of this nation's pupils will be minority, while 95% of their teachers will be white" (Fallon and Murray, cited in Watkins, 1989 p. 42). This is not to say that white teachers cannot effectively instruct language-minority students; however, these statistics suggest "that most pupils will not

be taught by a single minority teacher at any time in their school career" (Watkins, 1989 p. 42).

Even if sufficient numbers of minority teachers were entering classrooms across the United States, questions of ability to handle student diversity and classroom complexity remain. A random glance at preservice teacher education programs from four major U.S. institutions revealed that not one required a course in issues of second language development. Unfortunately, this situation is not atypical although over 50% of all public school teachers interact with language-minority students (U.S. Congressional Record, 1989; Penfield, 1987).

There are some efforts towards redirecting teacher preparation, but these efforts are clearly the exception and not the rule. For example, Project 30 is a reform group dedicated to redesigning teacher education with cultural and linguistic diversity in mind (Watkins, 1989). Some institutions provide mini-courses and electives in multicultural education, but again, they do not form a central focus of the program. Courses exist for those seeking certification in bilingual education, but only 2,000 to 3,500 trained bilingual teachers graduate from institutions of higher education annually (U.S. Congressional Record, 1989). With an overall teacher shortage of 160,000 teachers per year, all teachers will have to share in the education of this nation's diverse student population (Scarcella, 1990; Cantoni-Harvey, 1987) regardless of how adequately they are prepared.

The federal government has begun to respond to changing teacher preparation needs through the introduction of two bills. The bills (The Excellence in Teaching and the Bilingual Teacher Enhancement Acts sponsored by Senators Edward Kennedy and Claiborne Pell) authorized $300 million for FY 1990 to fund eight teacher training programs focusing on issues

of second language development for all teachers. Underlying the need for such legislation is the idea that expert mainstream teachers are not necessarily effective with language-minority students (Lucas, Henze and Donato, 1990; Enright, 1986).

Rationale

Given current and projected demographic trends regarding student population and the teaching pool, and the limitations of current preservice teacher preparation programs, classroom teachers will be educating a large percentage of language-minority students without adequate preparation. Therefore, the specific rationale of this inquiry is to examine the perspectives of three mainstream teachers as they educate language-minority students in the regular classroom. According to Scarcella (1990) there is ample information and research on second language development and pedagogy, bilingual education, multicultural education, ethnography of education and critical pedagogy. There is scant information, however, on the classroom teacher in relation to language-minority students. Focusing on beliefs, self-reported practices, and professional development needs, this naturalistic inquiry is one of the first to provide a platform for the mainstream teachers' voice.

Assumptions

There are a number of assumptions that have driven both the design, data collection process, and analysis of this inquiry. These assumptions include: (a) the interpretive nature of reality; (b) the necessity of tapping into the intuitive wisdom of teachers; (c) the importance for educators to focus on students and quality education over political commitments.

First, and fundamental to qualitative research methodology, is the interpretive nature of reality (Dewey, 1933, 1965) and the acknowledgement of multiple perspectives. In the words of Greene (personal communication, April 16, 1991), "There is no view from nowhere, each of us is a situated person." It is the individual's lens that ultimately makes sense of his/her world. Even with mandated reforms, uniform special programs or pre-packaged curricula, these reforms, programs and curricula must "be filtered through the minds and the hearts and the hands of teachers" (Ayers, 1989 p.5). Of specific importance to this study is the acceptance of the subjective nature that is embedded in the case histories and the analysis. The reader, therefore, is invited to participate as s/he makes sense of this inquiry.

The second assumption is the belief that teachers are "untapped sources of wisdom" (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986 p. 505) and that only by exploring this wisdom can teacher educators, staff developers and teachers themselves effectively plan and benefit from professional development opportunities. In spite of the fact that the majority of mainstream teachers have not been adequately prepared to teach linguistically and culturally diverse students, it is erroneous to assume that teachers have nothing to say about an issue that has impacted their classrooms. By understanding the teachers' perspectives, challenges and intuitive wisdom, the profession will be informed by its practitioners.

The third and final assumption is related to the ongoing debate about bilingual education and language policy in the United States. Debates concerning the most effective programmatic approach for language-minority students, the educational needs of linguistically and culturally diverse students, and the purposes of schools, abound in communities that have growing immigrant populations. According to McGroarty (1992)

> As long as schools serve linguistically diverse students, as long as educators seek a variety of ways to teach these students, and as long as symbolic issues related to language persist in public consciousness, the debate will continue. (p. 9)

The debate is important; however, it is not the purpose of this inquiry to present the issues or take sides. Because of the numbers of language-minority students that are in U.S. public schools, the numbers of mainstream teachers who are responsible for the education of these students, and the pace within which preservice teacher preparation programs are addressing this issue, the third assumption of this study is that educators must be advocates for students, not programs. In other words, there is room for all kinds of effective and innovative programs for language-minority students. However, in many contexts, these students would be better served if educators focused on upgrading the knowledge and skills of the teachers that "in reality" are responsible for the education of these students. This is not to say that continued recruitment and preparation of bilingual and ESL teachers be curtailed. The point is, regardless of where one is aligned in the political debate surrounding issues of language and cultural diversity, bilingual and ESL teachers can not educate all of this nation's language-minority students without the help of mainstream teachers and the community at large.

Significance

The significance of this study is linked to the increased funding and need for preservice and inservice teacher education programs targeted to the growing number of mainstream teachers who are responsible for the education of language-minority students. Teacher educators and staff developers, to date, have relied on their knowledge of second language development and their intuition in designing and implementing programs for

mainstream teachers. Relying on expertise and intuition is not enough, if teacher development and increased effectiveness with language-minority students is the goal. According to Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1986) "teacher educators must build on or rebuild what teachers and teachers-to-be already believe about their work" (p.523). What is missing in the planning and implementation of professional development opportunities is the voice of the mainstream teacher, his/her intuitive knowledge. Exploring and documenting the beliefs, claimed practices and professional development needs of mainstream teachers is perhaps the missing component to a greater understanding of the mainstream teachers' challenge. Deeper understanding could provide insights to those responsible for designing and implementing preservice and inservice teacher education, and pave the way for further research.

The following chapters contain the body of the study. In chapter two the educational literature that informed this study is reviewed. Chapter three describes the research methodology. In chapter four, the case histories of the three teacher informants are presented. Chapter five includes the cross-case analysis and discussion. Chapter six contains conclusions and implications for practice and research.

Chapter II

Review of the Literature

The purpose of this study is to explore and describe the beliefs, self-reported practices and professional development needs of three mainstream teachers who are responsible for the education of language-minority students. Because of the uniqueness of this study, that is, the merger of mainstream educational concerns with issues of second language development, the literature review encompasses six broad areas. Only those, studies, however, that have relevance to this inquiry are included.

Part one, a description of existing programs and alternatives for language-minority students, is meant to provide context, define terminology from the literature, and describe characteristics of existing programs. Part two examines relevant research pertaining to teacher beliefs. Part three, an introduction to the enormous body of research on teacher expectations, provides the framework for a more specific look at teacher attitudes towards students with diverse linguistic behavior and cultural backgrounds. Part four, a review of teacher efficacy research, is meant to illuminate potential effects on student success when teachers feel universally or personally inadequate in the classroom. With the influx of language-minority students in the regular classroom and the lack of preparation for classroom teachers, feelings of frustration on the part of the teacher are common. Part five examines teacher attitudes towards the mainstreaming of special education students for the purpose of understanding how teachers have reacted to the return of these students into the regular classroom. It must be emphasized that language-minority students are in no way considered special education students, but the

experiences and attitudes of teachers toward mainstreaming has informed this study. Part six, a review of related studies, looks at both conceptually and methodologically similar research.

Programs and Alternatives for Language-Minority Students

Before describing the programs and alternatives for language-minority students, it is necessary to mention some of the legislation that has shaped programmatic options. The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 (later to become Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) was aimed at economically disadvantaged Latinos and Native Americans. The Act required schools to take "affirmative steps" to provide non-native speakers of English the necessary skills to participate in school (Scarcella, 1990). However, those "affirmative steps" were never spelled out. In 1974, the Bilingual Education Act was revised to create a wider range of programs for the increase and diversification of language-minority students. During the same year, the Supreme Court case of Lau vs. Nichols ordered "appropriate relief" to Chinese students who were failing in school because they did not understand the language of instruction (Wong, 1989a). The importance of Lau vs. Nichols was that guidelines for "appropriate relief" were not specified (Scarcella, 1990; Wong, 1988a; Wong-Fillmore and Valadez, 1986). In 1975, the Lau Remedies were created to provide guidelines, but they were not part of the Supreme Court Decision. Perhaps the inability of legislators and the absence of the Supreme Court to delineate specific guidelines for serving language-minority students is the reason for inconsistency in school programs and lower court decisions today.

Articulating the range of programmatic approaches for language-minority students in the United States is in itself problematic because of the

role of interpretation and the nature of the terminology. First, the wide range of programs and alternatives reflects the different interpretations of the Lau Remedies and bilingual research (Cummins, 1988). In addition, they reflect philosophical differences underlying language policy, bilingualism and the nature of teaching and learning second languages (McKay, 1988; Hakuta, 1986). Moreover, terminology used to describe programs and alternatives for language-minority students is frequently inconsistent and confusing. Cummins (1988) cites the term immersion as an example, as it has been used to describe at least four different types of programs, ranging from submersion to bilingual. Finally, not only is there a range of programs and alternatives for language-minority students, there is varied pedagogy within each program. In other words, a spectrum of instructional approaches may be employed within each type of program.

Depending on the social, political and economic context of the school, programs for language-minority students include submersion, ESL, and bilingual. In order to distinguish these alternatives, McKay (1988) has placed the models on a continuum, with submersion and bilingual representing polar goals: cultural assimilation or cultural pluralism. What follows is a summary of the programmatic alternatives for language-minority students.

Submersion

In some senses, submersion has been called the paradoxical approach for language-minority students because there is no formal program. It is essentially based on the "sink or swim" method of second language acquisition which argues that children will "pick up" English by merely being exposed to it. Supporting submersion is the insufficient exposure hypothesis which attributes lack of English language progress and school failure to inadequate

exposure to English. Although intuitively appealing, this hypothesis lacks research support. Numerous studies report that language-minority students, over time, acquire English language academic skills despite spending considerably less time instructed in English than comparable students instructed entirely in English (Hakuta, 1986, Cummins, 1989). Krashen (1982) claims that comprehensible input, the ability to which language-minority students understand the language, not exposure, is key to second language development. Krashen argues that even when language-minority students are exposed to English, they tend to "tune-out" if there is no comprehensible input.

In submersion, language-minority students are placed in mainstream classrooms and the responsibility is on the classroom teacher to provide special help to these students. Therefore, mainstream teachers must have some understanding of second language acquisition, the nature of language proficiency and communicative competence.

Language proficiency is currently defined as being more than four skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking). According to Cummins (1980) language proficiency is comprised of cognitive/academic language proficiency (CALP) "which can be assessed by a variety of reading, writing, listening and speaking tests" (p. 176) and basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) which includes accent, fluency and sociolinguistic competence. Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) suggest that language proficiency is frequently replaced by the term communicative competence

Communicative competence (Hymes 1972), is rooted in Chomsky's (1965) conception of language. Chomsky stressed grammatical competence and suggested a theory that included the second language speaker's knowledge of grammatical rules and the ability to use them in context (Canale and Swain, -

1980). Hymes (1972), dissatisfied with Chomsky's theory, added the sociocultural aspect. Thus, communicative competence for Hymes (1972) is the ability to use language in socially appropriate ways.

Building upon Chomsky (1965) and Hymes (1972), Canale and Swain (1980) suggested in their earliest descriptive model of communicative competence three strands of competence: grammatical, sociolinguistic and strategic. Grammatical competence is similar to that of Chomsky and Hymes in that it is the structural component. Sociolinguistic competence is built on the work of Hymes and is defined as the "rules that specify the ways in which utterances are produced and understood appropriately" (Canale and Swain, 1980 p. 31). Finally, strategic competence is the repertoire that the speaker has in order to compensate for breakdowns in communication.

In addition to understanding second language development and the nature of language proficiency, mainstream teachers must also understand the additional processes that comprise classroom life (Heath, 1983; Cazden, 1986; Chaudron, 1988; Richards and Hurley, 1990). Richards and Hurley (1990) suggest that the demands of the mainstream classroom are comprised of three basic processes: interactional, instructional-task and cognitive.

Interactional demands, according to Richards and Hurley (1990) is the ability to comprehend and participate in the social demands of the classroom and the school. Included in the social demands are knowledge of the norms to initiate, sustain, and close communication with both teachers, classmates and school personnel. In addition, understanding the norms of turn-taking, appropriate times to move around the classroom, and how to demonstrate knowledge must be understood.

There are numerous examples of how language-minority students misunderstand interactional demands or are misunderstood by their teachers.

For example, American Indian, native Hawaiian, Chinese and Filipino students have generally not followed Anglo norms for turn-taking. American Indian and Hawaiian students have a tendency not to raise their hands (Philips, 1972). Chinese and Filipino students expect to be called on, and do not generally take risks in their answers (Philips, 1972; Teruya and Wong, 1972; Gallimore, Boggs and Jordon, 1974; Richards and Hurley, 1990).

Instructional-task demands, the second dimension of classroom life, is the ability to grasp the nature of learning and classroom work. Instructional-task demands are the kinds of learning tasks that are present across subject areas. For example, Tikunoff (1985) maintains that students must understand classroom activities in terms of "order, pacing, product, learning strategies, participation and resources" (p.19-20).

Likewise, Doyle (1983) suggests that there are four central tasks that are included in classroom work. They are: memory, procedural or routine tasks, comprehension or understanding, and opinion. Doyle maintains that labels, although obvious for classroom tasks, may be ambiguous. For example, "writing" in one class may mean copying from the board, or it may mean the process of writing which includes brainstorming, drafting and revising.

Examples abound of the potential problems that language-minority students have in misunderstanding an instructional task demand or being misunderstood. For example, Dale and Cuevas (1987) suggest that if teachers ask language-minority students how they arrived at a mathematical answer, language-minority students will have to be familiar with language learning strategies and how to discuss the processes of math.

In addition to interactional demands and instructional task demands, the third and final dimension of classroom life are the cognitive demands. The cognitive demands consist of the ability to assimilate concepts and schemata

that are essential to different school subjects. Richards and Hurley (1990) identify two key areas. They are: (a) assimilating concepts and information according to subject area; (b) using and understanding the language employed and modes of inquiry within subject areas.

There are countless examples of the cognitive difficulties that language-minority students may face across subject areas. For example, in social studies there a number of concepts such as "liberty", "conflict", "minority rights", "equal opportunity" that are crucial to a unit on African-Americans. It is assumed that a child entering fifth grade will have a full understanding of many of these concepts. Without these concepts, however, the content will not be understood.

Another example of content area difficulties is found in math. First, there are many words which are unique to math. Moreover, there are numerous synonyms for the same mathematical concept. For example, "'subtract from', 'decrease by' 'less' 'minus' 'take away' all represent subtraction" (Richards and Hurley, 1990). Finally, syntax frequently causes problems for language-minority students in that "the standard word order of English sentences must often be reversed in writing math problems. "Eight divided by two" is written 2 8" (Richards and Hurley, 1990 p.153).

Finally, there are cognitive difficulties for language-minority students in science. Hurd et. al. (1981) reports that in grades six through nine, science textbooks introduce approximately 2500 new vocabulary words a year. In addition, there is a high rate of the use of the conditional and students must be able to distinguish between fact and inference.

Although refuted by the research of Krashen (1982, 1985) and Cummins (1979, 1980, 1982), submersion is based on the assumption that exposure to the target language is the key to acquisition. In order for submersion to be an

effective choice, mainstream teachers must understand the demands of the mainstream classroom on the language-minority student. Moreover, there are assumptions which underlay the selection of submersion as a viable approach for the education of language-minority students. Submersion assumes an assimilationist model (McKay, 1988). In other words, the sooner that English is acquired, the sooner one becomes initiated into mainstream American culture. This also implies the lower status of the first language (L1) compared to English (Trueba, 1989).

Although submersion may be "discriminatory in fact, but neutral on the surface" (Dobray 1984 cited in Wong, 1988a p. 379), it constitutes a highly popular approach. According to the Council of Chief State School Officers (Lara, Minch and Hoffman, 1990), 29% of all language-minority students could be considered to be in submersion programs because they are not receiving language-services, and in four states the percentage is as high as 60%.

English as a Second Language (ESL)

In ESL programs, language-minority students are pulled out of the regular classroom for English language instruction, which varies in numbers of students and hours during the week. Instructors are frequently trained in ESL and instruction consists of activities that promote English language acquisition. ESL, like submersion, assumes an assimilationist standpoint in that the focus is on the acquisition of a second language (L2) with no support for the maintenance of L1. Underlying ESL programs is the notion that formal instruction is crucial in order for language-minority students to achieve proficiency in English. However, some research suggests that language is acquired through natural sequences (Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1990; Krashen, 1985; Ellis, 1986), specifically the acquisition of morphemes (Dulay

and Burt, 1974), negative formation (Adams, 1978) and question formation (Ravem, 1978). This raises questions about the importance of formal instruction. Hence, given what is known about second language acquisition, the issue is not whether formal instruction is essential, but understanding ways that formal instruction helps learning (Littlewood, 1984).

Content-based ESL, which is teaching English through academic content, is used in order to help language-minority students develop conceptual knowledge. There has been a recent interest in content-based ESL classes, because of the necessity for language-minority students to learn English and participate in the mainstream classroom (Cantoni-Harvey, 1987; Snow, Met, and Genesee, 1989; Brinton, Snow and Wesche, 1989; Chamot and O'Malley, 1989). Because of this recent interest, the rationale behind content-based ESL instruction is described in more detail in the following subsection.

Content-based ESL.

Unlike many ESL approaches where language is taught in isolation from subject matter, the recent shift to content-based ESL methods is fueled by a number of theoretical rationales.

Krashen's (1982) acquisition-learning hypothesis provides the first rationale for the integration of content and language instruction. This hypothesis suggests that language-minority students have two ways to develop L2; learning and acquisition. Learning is gaining formal knowledge about the language through instruction that includes explicit presentation of grammatical structures. In contrast, acquisition is similar to how children develop L1. For children, the processes of first language acquisition and cognitive development are inseparable. In the content-based ESL class, language and cognitive development are emphasized as language is the

medium for learning content. The work of Krashen strongly suggests that acquisition is more important to overall language development than learning.

The second rationale is closely related to the first in that it includes Krashen's (1982) input hypothesis. Krashen postulates that language structures are acquired when understanding is comprehensible. Comprehensible input suggests that comprehension occurs just beyond the students' current level: i + 1 (Krashen, 1985). This means that language can be understood even when it contains unfamiliar structures. What is required is the utilization of "context, extra-linguistic information, and knowledge of the world" (Krashen, 1982 p. 58). In the content-based language classroom language is acquired when the focus is on meaning, not structure (Snow, Met, Genesee, 1989; Brinton, Snow, Wesche, 1989).

Motivation and relevance is the third rationale for content-based ESL instruction (Snow, Met, Genesee, 1989; Brinton, Snow, Wesche, 1989). If the content is perceived as relevant to the learner it is assumed that learner motivation will be high. The acquisition of English, for language-minority students, means more than the ability to communicate in English. Language-minority students must use English as a vehicle to learn subject matter.

The fourth rationale for content-based ESL instruction is the distinction between social and academic language (Cummins, 1980). Cummins (1979, 1980, 1982) distinguishes between basic interpersonal communication skills, (BICS) and cognitive/academic language proficiency (CALPS). BICS is everyday, context-embedded, interpersonal language, which according to Cummins (1980) may be acquired in two years. CALPS on the other hand, is academic, context-reduced language, and may take from five to seven years to acquire. CALPS is only acquired in school settings through academic content.

Finally, Heath (1983) posits that academic subjects and life in schools are characterized by language and register variation. These variations may be necessary in order for language-minority students to master academic content. In the content-based ESL class, instruction recognizes "the importance of language structures, skills or functions that are characteristic of different content areas" (Snow, Met, Genesee, 1989 p. 203).

In sum, content-based ESL has emerged out of the reexamination of ESL approaches for language-minority students in public schools, and the necessity for language-minority students not only to acquire English, but master academic content. The rationale is based on theories of second language acquisition which focus on meaning over structure, the importance of relevance for student motivation, the distinction between academic and social language, and language and register variation in academic and school settings.

Bilingual

Bilingual programs, those that include instruction in language-minority students' L1 and the target language, are based on the idea that languages are acquired interdependently. The linguistic interdependence hypothesis posits that there is a "common underlying language-proficiency (CUP) that makes possible the transfer of cognitive/academic or literacy related skills across languages" (Cummins, 1989 p. 44). In other words, higher order cognitive processes such as, summarizing, inferring, predicting, and analyzing, transfer from one language to another. In addition to the linguistic interdependence hypothesis, bilingual programs assume that bilingualism is cognitively beneficial. Research supports that bilingualism positively affects concept formation, creativity, analogical reasoning, visual

spatial skills, and problem-solving (Dulay, Burt and Krashen, 1982; Diaz and Klinger, 1991).

Bilingual programs, which include transitional and maintenance designs, are varied and inconsistent in terms of scheduling, teacher expertise, instructional materials, methods and content, use of native language and English, and administrative and parental support. According to McKay (1988) this lack of coherent philosophy, definition, and program implementation makes it difficult to evaluate bilingual education as an alternative.

Transitional bilingual programs, which are based on the assimilationist model, are designed to facilitate L2 acquisition at the potential expense of L1. Bilingualism in transitional programs is seen as a means for the acquisition of English (Wong-Fillmore and Valadez, 1986). The assumption being that unless language-minority students are proficient in English they will not be able to participate fully in school and society.

In contrast, maintenance programs are based on pluralism. They are designed to maintain L1 as L2 is acquired. The ultimate goal is full literacy in both L1 and L2. The native language in bilingual maintenance programs is seen as a viable asset in overall cognitive development (Wong-Fillmore and Valadez, 1986).

Theoretically, in both transitional and maintenance programs, bilingual teachers must have bilingual certification and should be bilingual, although in reality there are not enough certified professionals and bilingual speakers to fill the need. Frequently bilingual teachers have temporary certification, and not all are fully bilingual. In fact, there are cases where bilingual teachers are monolingual, speaking one language other than English. In their classrooms, bilingual teachers generally decide how much emphasis should be given to which language. According to experts, initial

learning should be in the native language (Cummins, 1989; Trueba, 1989; Hakuta, 1986; Krashen, 1985), but with teacher shortages and questionable bilingual proficiency, emphasis on the language of instruction may depend on the teachers' language proficiency. Even with the variety of bilingual programs, only 1 in 10 language-minority students was enrolled in a bilingual program in 1980 (Scarcella, 1990). In the following subsections bilingual immersion and bilingual two-way programs are described.

Bilingual immersion.

Bilingual immersion programs are based on the rationale that the processes of first and second language acquisition are similar. In other words, acquisition occurs when students are exposed to natural language and they are motivated to communicate. Therefore, students in bilingual immersion programs are taught subject matter in the language they are to learn (Wong-Fillmore and Meyer, 1992). Bilingual immersion programs assume a pluralistic model in that the goal is the creation of balanced bilinguals. Wong-Fillmore and Valadez (1986) cite the essential characteristics of successful immersion programs. They are: (a) linguistically homogeneous classes; (b) balanced bilingual teachers; (c) subject matter taught in L2; (d) L2 learned through authentic and meaningful communication. The most widely documented immersion program, which is frequently used as evidence for replication with language-minority students in the U.S., is the Quebec model. However, the context and circumstances between the U.S. and Canada are quite different, which makes comparison and replication dangerous. For example, in the Quebec immersion program, the students are not language-minority; they are speakers of English, the primary language of society. In addition, the

Canadian students are from middle-class families who volunteer to participate in the Quebec immersion program because the acquisition of French is valued.

In contrast, students in many immersion programs in the U.S. are language-minority, frequently not from the middle class, and often enter the program without full development of L1. The differences between the U.S and Canadian contexts are crucial in understanding why many of the Canadian immersion programs have generally met with success, and the U.S. programs have not.

In fact, many United States programs that are labeled immersion are really submersion. The differences between immersion and submersion programs are frequently overlooked. For example, submersion teachers are monolingual, immersion teachers are bilingual. Submersion sacrifices L1 development for the acquisition of L2 while immersion proposes to develop both languages with the goal of creating balanced bilinguals. Submersion assumes an assimilationist model, immersion assumes a pluralistic model. Immersion programs are relatively rare in the United States. Reasons for this situation include the scarcity of credentialed balanced bilingual teachers, the heterogeneous nature of students' L2 proficiency, and the need for parental and public support. As of 1982, there were only 27 existing immersion programs (Trueba, 1989).

Bilingual two-way.

Bilingual two-way programs, the polar extreme to submersion, represent a pluralistic view of language. Like bilingual immersion, two-way bilingual programs assume that bilingualism is beneficial for both language-minority and majority students. Both programs assume the existence of a common underlying language-proficiency (CUP). They differ in that initial

literacy skills are taught through L1 in bilingual two-way programs (McKay, 1988). In this model, English speaking students are placed with language-minority students, with the goal being proficiency for all students in two languages. In the early grades, students can be segregated for native language instruction, nevertheless language-minority students have ample opportunities to interact with native speakers.

Teachers in two-way bilingual programs must be fully bilingual. Or if there is a team approach, teachers responsible for L1 and L2 instruction must collaborate. Moreover, these programs demand public and parental support.

Summary

Clearly, each program or alternative for language-minority students has advantages and disadvantages depending on one's view concerning linguistic and cultural diversity. It is unfortunate; however, that many educators base program decisions on political debate as opposed to educational effectiveness (Trueba, 1989; Wong-Fillmore and Valadez, 1986). In spite of where one is aligned in the current debate of which program alternative serves the best interests of all students, there seems to be agreement on one basic assumption. That is,

> regardless of the specific approach, all language minority students require special supplemental education services if they are to learn English, reap the full benefits of schooling and enter the mainstream of American life (Willner, 1985, p.1).

As mentioned previously, despite the Lau decision, many language-minority students are still not receiving language services. For example, the New York City Public Schools are not providing services to over 44,000 language-minority students, almost 40% of those entitled by law (Willner, 1985). And according to O'Malley (1982) 58% of all eligible children nationwide

were in mainstream classrooms with only some remedial English provided in some schools (O'Malley, 1982).

The impact of failing to meet the needs of so many language-minority students is unknown. What is known nevertheless, is that the drop out rate for some language minority students is proportionately higher than that of the general school population (Kaufman and Frase, 1990; Lara, Minch and Hoffman, 1990; Chamot and O'Malley, 1989; Wong-Fillmore and Valadez, 1986). Given the educational requirements of the job market, there are increasingly less opportunities for those who drop out of school (Chamot and O'Malley, 1989), making the failure to deal effectively with language-minority students all the more critical.

Teacher Beliefs

The abundance of process-product research, conducted prior to 1975, has provided educators with valuable information into the relationships between teachers' and students' classroom behavior and student achievement (Clark and Peterson, 1986). However, these empirical studies, dominated by the behaviorist research paradigm, ignored the mental lives or unobservable behavior of teachers and students. Guided by the assumption that there is a relationship between teachers' beliefs and behavior, it is essential that teacher beliefs be understood.

Philip Jackson (1968) in Life in Classrooms understood the importance of describing the mental lives of teachers as he was one of the first to depart from the behaviorist research paradigm. He attempted to describe the full nature of the teaching task, which includes both observable and unobservable teacher behavior. The study of the mental lives of teachers implies that teaching is more than a mechanical process, that it is mediated through the

hearts and minds of the teachers themselves. Jackson's (1968) naturalistic work provided "a glimpse at the hidden side of teaching" (Clark and Peterson, 1986 p. 256) in order to more fully understand the processes of classroom life, and paved the way for new directions in research on teaching.

Fueled by Jackson, and reinforced by the outcome of the National Institute of Education's National Conference on Studies of Teaching in 1974, research on teachers' thought processes became an important new direction for research on teaching. Specifically, Panel 6, directed by Lee Schulman reconceptualized the view of the teacher as clinician, which includes not only the ability to diagnose and prescribe learning remedies in diverse contexts, but to link the body of empirical and theoretical literature with teachers' expectations and beliefs (National Institute of Education, 1975). This view of the teacher implied the subjectively human element of the teaching process and the "value of understanding the insiders viewpoint" (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986 p. 505).

Since 1975, teacher beliefs has emerged as one branch of the enormous body of literature that comprises research on teacher thinking. However, the study of teacher beliefs is still in its infancy. One reason for this is the difficulty in conceptualizing, describing and measuring internal processes. In fact, there is much focus in the literature on the dilemmas inherent in studying beliefs and the rationale for using qualitative methodology. For example, Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1986) suggest the difficulties in trying to articulate one's beliefs, especially since a variety of beliefs may overlap with one another. In addition, in his case study of the beliefs of Ellen, a life science teacher, Munby (1982) cautions researchers against "shared perceptions" (p. 201) that is, the assumption that the researcher will necessarily interpret accurately what the the informant believes.

Not only are there methodological issues in studying teacher beliefs, but there are definition issues as well (Pajares, 1992). Beliefs have been defined in the research literature in a variety of ways. However, even as definitions vary, there appears to be an inclusion of words which are subjective and individual in nature, such as, attitudes, perceptions, values, experiences, intuition, expectations, and feelings.

For example, Underhill (1988), in his review of studies of mathematics teachers' beliefs about diagnostic and prescriptive mathematics, defines beliefs as attitudes or ideals. Nespor (1984) in her quest for a theoretical model of teacher beliefs, defines beliefs as "frequently involving moods, feelings, emotions and subjective evaluations" (p.323). Finally, Lampert, in her exploration of how beliefs inform practice (1984), uses the term "intuitive knowledge" (p.2) as similar to Nespor's (1984, 1987) definition, in that it is subjective and based on personal experience.

Because of the relative newness of studying teacher beliefs, and the methodological problems encountered in exploring the mental lives of teachers, five case studies (Janesick, 1977; Elbaz, 1981; Lampert, 1984; Munby, 1984; Nespor, 1987) have directly informed this inquiry.

The first study by Janesick (1977) sought to understand the perspective of one sixth grade teacher's perceived role. Perspective, defined by Janesick, is a socially constructed interpretation of one's experiences. Combining beliefs, values, and interpretations, these perspectives serve as frames of references within which meaning is made.

Janesick's ethnographic inquiry took seven months. As a participant observer, Janesick discovered that for one teacher, cooperation was fundamental for the success of a classroom activity. From this one teacher's

perspective, creating a cooperative environment was the commitment on which plans, decisions and activities were based.

Elbaz (1981), disturbed by the view that teachers are "passive transmitters of knowledge" (p. 43), did a case study of Sarah, an English teacher. Through open-ended interviews and classroom observations, Elbaz sought to understand how Sarah's beliefs inform practice. The concept of "practical knowledge" (p. 43) emerged from Elbaz's work. Practical knowledge, composed of five categories: knowledge of subject, curriculum, instruction, self, and the culture of schools, operates holistically. Practical knowledge, according to Elbaz, helps teachers make sense of the realities of classroom life.

Whereas Elbaz explored one teacher's practical knowledge, Lampert (1984) focused on how teachers could use "intuitive knowledge" (Bamberger, 1978, cited in Lampert, 1984 p. 2) in order to solve day to day classroom dilemmas. Intuitive knowledge, contrasted with formal knowledge, is "commonsense sort of information from personal experimentation on the physical environment" (Lampert, 1984, p. 2).

Seven teacher-participants volunteered to attend weekly seminars where classroom issues were discussed. The discussions were documented and analyzed. The results indicate that teachers use intuitive knowledge to manage their classroom conflicts. This idea challenges the traditional notion that educational research will find solutions for practitioners.

In another study, Munby (1984) explored the beliefs of one science teacher (Ellen) through a series of interviews, in order to understand how curricular innovations are implemented. Munby's research was based on the assumption that what a teacher believes is essential to what new innovations s/he adopts.

Munby adapted the Repertory Grid Technique from Kelly (1955, cited in Clark and Peterson, 1986) for his first interview with Ellen. Using this technique, Munby attempted to understand individual constructs that impact behavior. Kelly's technique includes concepts on cards that are given to the informant who in turn must sort them and explain his/her rationale. The groups of cards are named constructs and put on a grid to demonstrate relationships. Munby adapted the repertory grid technique by eliciting the constructs from Ellen, instead of supplying them for her.

During the second interview, Ellen was shown the factor analysis from the grid and asked why she grouped constructs as she did. From discussion with the researcher, she was able to name the groups and articulate her beliefs. Results of this study revealed that student confidence and independence were important beliefs that influenced Ellen's review and implementation of new materials. Munby concluded that, based on her beliefs, Ellen would be more likely to look at new materials for evidence that these materials will help students gain confidence.

The importance of Munby's study is not necessarily the articulation of one science teacher's beliefs, but the adaptation of the repertory grid technique to explore teacher beliefs. Eliciting concepts from Ellen, instead of providing them, shifts the focus of the study from researcher controlled to informant controlled.

The Teacher Beliefs Study (Nespor, 1987) is the final study that has informed this inquiry into the dilemmas and ways of studying teacher beliefs. The focus of this study was to explore the influence of school environmental constraints and teacher beliefs on classroom performance. Nespor found that it is the interaction of beliefs and constraints that shape classroom behavior.

Nespor did case studies of three teachers in two schools. Data collection consisted of videotaped observations, four simulated recall interviews, and four open-ended interviews. Nespor explored the contextual influences of teaching and the importance of taking into account the subjective nature of the construction of meaning.

Beliefs, according to Nespor, are held for many things, and on the surface seem contradictory. Nespor argues that beliefs and actions are connected by frames of references, and it is adherence to these frames of references that commitments are formed. It is beliefs that provide the language to articulate commitments. Through an analysis of the three teachers' actions and beliefs, four commitments were revealed: (a) career continuance; (b) teaching as a vocation; (c) teaching as a profession; (d) teaching as identity.

Nespor concluded the study by describing teacher environments as ever changing and context-specific. She suggests that research continue to explore the relationship between beliefs, commitments and adaptation strategies.

Summary

In spite of the dilemmas inherent in studying teachers' beliefs, the importance of understanding the internal processes, or beliefs that teachers hold, cannot be disputed. For it is beliefs, which include values, perceptions, expectations, intuition, and attitudes, that influence behavior.

All the studies reviewed contained small samples, nevertheless, Munby (1984) argues that "knowledge cannot be judged solely upon the criteria of its applicability, power is important too" (p. 38). Munby maintains that indepth, small sample studies into the nature of teachers' beliefs is a "powerful" way to inform the profession about the diversity of how teachers construct meaning.

Teacher Expectations

According to Good and Weinstein (1986) teacher expectations are "inferences that teachers make about the future academic achievement of students, and about the types of classroom assignments that students need given their abilities" (p.63). The evidence suggests that teachers' expectations make a difference in student success (Brophy and Good, 1986; Good and Weinstein, 1986). The notion of the self-fulfilling prophecy, one in which original erroneous teacher attitudes or perceptions lead students to fulfill expected roles, has been demonstrated in a variety of studies (Brophy and Good, 1987). Perhaps the most classic example is a study by Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) entitled Pygmalian in the Classroom, in which expectations were created by identifying some elementary school students as those that would excel academically. At the end of the year, students who were identified as excelling scored relatively higher in achievement tests than the other students.

Two years later, Rist (1970) reported similar effects of the self-fulfilling prophecy in a study where kindergarten students were placed in reading groups based on subjective characteristics such as appearance, language use, and social class. Students perceived as likely to succeed received consistent positive reinforcement and had positive interaction with the teacher. Preferential treatment of the more desirable groups of students continued through second grade.

Since Rosenthal and Jacobson's and Rist's research, numerous studies have produced a consensus that "teacher expectations can and sometimes do affect student-teacher interactions and student outcomes, and the processes involved are much more complex than originally believed" (Good and Brophy, 1987 p.118).

Since language-minority students exhibit a variety of language behaviors and represent diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds, the vast literature on teachers' expectations reviewed here is limited to studies dealing with language behaviors and culture.

Teachers' Expectations and Linguistic Variation

Language-minority students range in their ability to pronounce, express, use vocabulary and speak fluently. There are a number of studies which suggest that teachers perceive students with linguistic variation (non-standard speech, accented speech) as inferior to students who speak standard English. Moreover, Hudson (1980) maintains that students' speech patterns may be the basis of teachers' first impressions. In other words, important judgments are made about a person according to speech style (Harber, 1979). Therefore, understanding teacher beliefs, judgments and expectations in relation to linguistic variation is crucial given the homogeneity of this nation's teaching force and the diversity of the student population.

In one study, Bikson (1974) examined spontaneous speech performance of 144 elementary school students (white, African-American and Chicano) through objective linguistic measures such as response rate, vocabulary diversity, word usage, and uniformity. Sixty white teachers evaluated the speech performance. The analysis focused on whether minority children's speech was perceived as inferior to that of white children. The results indicated that the teachers consistently heard African-American and Chicano speech as inferior even though the speech had been objectively rated as equal according to Bickson's linguistic measures.

In another study, Choy and Dodd (1976) had three Japanese-American teachers evaluate eight non-standard and eight standard English speakers in

their respective homerooms on academic performance, classroom behavior and future endeavors. Evaluations consisted of two nominal scales to get at academic performance and classroom behavior, and a descriptive open-ended questionnaire to understand teachers' feelings toward future student endeavors. Choy and Dodd found that "teachers' evaluations and expectations for non-standard Hawaiian speakers were consistently worse than those of standard English speakers" (p.184).

Ramirez, Arce-Torres and Politzer (1978) explored the attitudes of both teachers and pupils towards linguistic variation in a Spanish/English bilingual classroom. In addition, they sought to determine whether teacher attitudes towards students with nonstandard speech could be changed through inservice teacher development.

Eighteen teachers and 279 students participated in this study. Only the findings about teacher attitudes have relevance, thus, the pupil findings are not included in this review. The teachers were divided into two groups. The treatment group attended two, two-hour workshops, which introduced the teachers to the concepts of balanced bilingualism and sociolinguistic variation.

After the treatment group attended the workshops, both groups were asked to react to taped voices of pupils that included standard English, two types of Latino-English, and one sample of code switching (Spanish English). The teachers judged the speech for school appropriateness, academic success, and correctness.

Ramirez, Arce-Torres and Politzer (1978) found that the teachers rated the standard English speech as the highest of all the speech varieties, except a few teachers who rated the code switching as high as standard English. Moreover, teacher attitudes towards non-standard speech did not appear to

change during the course of the study. The results suggest that relatively short inservice workshops may be inadequate to change teacher attitudes. In spite of the fact that the workshops did not change teacher attitudes, the researchers recommend issues of language variation be included in teacher education.

Likewise, Harber (1979) surveyed 400 undergraduate education majors in order to understand more about attitudes towards non-standard speech. The survey consisted of stimulus statements about Black English. Responses were limited to a four-part Likert scale.

The results indicated that 50% of the respondents perceived that reading, spelling and writing would be more difficult for non-standard speakers. Thirteen percent felt that math would be more difficult. Thirty-three percent felt that non-standard speakers would have more trouble following directions and 85% reported that culturally relevant materials should be developed.

In an experimental study that yielded similar results, Smith and Denton (1980) found that teaching candidates expected that speakers of standard English would perform better academically than speakers of non-standard English.

Eighty-one secondary level teaching candidates were divided randomly into two groups, and were given the task of rating speech behaviors of six students, two African-American, two Mexican-American, two Anglo. Three samples of students' speech, one from each ethnic group, were characteristically non-standard. Before rating the students, only group one saw a videotaped lecture on sociolinguistics, dialect and linguistic variation, and engaged in a discussion about language.

Smith and Denton found that the teacher candidates in treatment group one, those that viewed and participated in the videotape and discussion on sociolinguistics, had consistently higher expectations of all the learners than the teaching candidates in the control group. One criticism of this study however, is the short time between the videotape and discussion and the teacher rating of student language. It is questionable if higher expectations would be sustained over a longer period of time. Like Ramirez, Arce-Torres and Politzer (1978), Smith and Denton recommended courses in sociolinguistics be included in teacher education.

Teacher Expectations and Cultural Diversity

In addition to exhibiting a variety of speech behaviors, language-minority students belong to a range of racial, ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Ethnicity and culture, as well as language variation, form the basis of teachers' attitudes and impressions, which can be linked to academic success.

For example, Williams (1973) demonstrated that ethnicity, or visual cues, was responsible for student teachers' evaluations of students' speech. Videotapes were made of the backs of three ethnically different children (white, African-American and Latino). It was clear to the viewer that the children were speaking yet their mouths and faces were not visible. The researchers dubbed the voices, without the viewer realizing that it was not the speech of the three children.

Student teachers were asked to evaluate the speech patterns of the three children on the videotape in terms of standardness and fluency. In all cases, the speech of the white child was rated as standard and confident. The speech

of the African-American child was rated predominantly as non-standard, and the speech of the Latino child was rated as less confident.

Williams maintains that the speech evaluations of the student teachers corresponded to stereotypes found in the literature for white, African-American and Latino children. He concluded that the student teachers in his study used visual clues, that is, made judgments and held beliefs about the three children in the videotape based on their ethnicity.

In another study, DeMeis and Turner (1978) examined the relationship between teacher evaluations and students' race, physical attractiveness and dialect. Sixty-eight white elementary school teachers listened to student tapes accompanied by student pictures. The students' speech was either Black English or standard English. The students' themselves were either African-American or white, and their physical attractiveness was rated as high, medium, and low. The teachers evaluated the students in terms of personality, quality of response, and current and future academic abilities.

Results indicated that overall non-standard, less attractive African-American students were consistently evaluated as inferior. Moreover, the teachers' ratings of personality, quality of response and academic success were consistent with one another. The findings support that academic problems may be attributed to the students' race and dialect as opposed to actual student performance.

In a theoretically and methodologically different study than that of Williams (1973), and Demeis and Turner (1978), Maldonado-Guzman (1980) studied teachers' differential treatment of children in two bilingual classrooms through viewing and analyzing videotapes. In addition to discovering that differential treatment occurs within cultural groups, i.e. Latino teachers with Latino students, Maldonado-Guzman suggests that

differential treatment is rooted in "experiential history of individuals and groups" (p. 2). Criticism, therefore, of much of the research on teacher expectations and student achievement is that it fails to take into account the social structures that influence teachers' beliefs, expectations and behavior.

Maldonado-Guzman articulated five aspects of the history of groups that form the theoretical basis of differential treatment between teachers and students. They are: (a) ethnocentrism; (b) orthodoxy; (c) motive or intent; (d) attraction; (e) philosophy and ideology. Maldonado-Guzman argues that the above theoretical constructs are not mutually exclusive; however, they are a useful taxonomy for analyzing social interactions that include differential treatment.

Ethnocentrism, the belief that one's cultural and ethnic ways are superior to others, is the first aspect. Ethnocentric behavior may be expressed in both tacit and unconscious levels of behavior.

The second aspect is orthodoxy, which "is the adherence to what one perceives as the accepted, customary or traditional beliefs and behaviors" (p.2). Unaccepted behaviors and beliefs of the society at large are seen as illegitimate. Orthodoxy, like ethnocentrism, may be expressed both tacitly or consciously. It frequently manifests itself in social or cultural experiences, but may be individual as well.

The third aspect is motive or intent, which refers to the needs and desires that one wants to obtain from other groups or individuals. Motive or intent may be manifested in observable, manipulatory behaviors.

Attraction is the fourth aspect, which is characterized "by preferences, likes or dislikes of a group or individual" (p.3). In an interaction, attraction may manifest itself overtly or unconsciously.

The final aspect is philosophy or ideology. It is characterized as "the articulated organization of thoughts and knowledge about the world, the immediate environment and human processes" (p. 3). Individual and group behavior may be rationalized through the aspect of philosophy. During social interactions, philosophy may embody ethnocentrism, orthodoxy, motive and attraction.

The outcome of Maldonado-Guzman's ethnographic study of differential treatment in bilingual classrooms revealed two essential methodological and theoretical concerns. First, Maldonado-Guzman asserts that the self-fulfilling prophecy and individual determinism that has driven the research of teacher behavior and student achievement is deceivingly narrow. Individual teacher behavior does not work in a vacuum. Sociocultural dimensions interact and influence teachers' differential treatment. It is multi-directional; therefore, a naturalistic approach to the study of the dynamic relationships between individual and social behavior is recommended.

Second, ethnocentric differential treatment is not limited between diverse ethnic, racial or cultural groups. It occurs within major cultural groups. Geographic diversity, length of residence, assimilation trends, religion, socioeconomic status may cause ethnocentric differential treatments within groups. This fact is extremely important considering the demographic profiles of this nation's teaching force and the changing student population.

Summary

As exemplified by the above studies, language behavior, race and ethnicity influence teachers' beliefs, expectations, perceptions and attitudes. The importance of this is that expectations, perceptions and attitudes are translated into teacher behavior, and it is this behavior that influences

students' ability to succeed. Teachers, however, do not behave independently from society: they are products of society. Language attitudes are mirrored in social structures, which may be used to discriminate against and to categorize (Hymes, 1966 cited in Saville-Troike, 1989). Teachers alone cannot change societal values and structures. But they can recognize and face their own prejudices. In addition, they can, with other educators, examine the role that schools and society plays in the education of all students.

In spite of the methodological and theoretical questions that have been raised by Maldonado-Guzman (1980), the findings of the above studies are fairly consistent. That is, standard English is generally seen as superior to non-standard varieties and accented speech. In addition, white, standard English speakers are most often expected to succeed, and the success of non-standard and culturally different students is questionable.

Finally, although there are questions of format, content and time, some findings suggest that attitudes, expectations and beliefs may be changed by preservice and inservice teacher education. It is recommended that preservice and inservice teacher education include course work in sociolinguistics and bilingualism. The questions should focus on format and content that would best change attitudes and increase awareness.

Teacher Efficacy Research

Closely related to both teacher beliefs and teacher expectations is the notion of teacher efficacy. Teachers' perceptions of their own efficacy in educating language-minority students is as important as their beliefs about and attitudes towards their students.

Brophy and Everston (1976) found that a positive teacher attitude was associated with student achievement gains. They found that effective teachers

believed that their students had the ability to learn, and they (the teachers) could satisfy individual needs. These results are particularly interesting to this study, in that they coincide with the researcher's experience as a teacher educator. Teachers have expressed a sense of frustration in working with language-minority students because of their own sense of inadequacy.

Ashton and Webb (1986) define efficacy as "teacher's beliefs regarding the ability of a student to learn in school, and the teacher's confidence that he or she can teach students effectively" (p.3). More specifically, they characterize two types of efficacy, personal and universal. Personal efficacy, according to Ashton and Webb, is the belief in one's competence as a teacher. Universal efficacy is the belief that teachers and the profession can have an impact on student's success.

Ashton and Webb (1986) spent a decade studying teacher efficacy and student achievement which is based on cognitive social learning theory (Bandura, 1977). Bandura argues that self-efficacy, a cognitive process, monitors behavior. Behavior is not regulated by outcome, but the expectations of effect. According to Bandura, expectations and outcome are distinguishable because individuals have the ability to believe that certain actions will cause certain outcomes. However, if they do not believe, they will not behave appropriately. In other words, beliefs about the outcome of behavior is perhaps a stronger incentive than the actual outcome itself.

In a two-year efficacy study, Ashton and Webb (1986) sought to: "(a) develop a conceptual framework for understanding the nature, antecedents, and consequences of efficacy attitudes in teachers and; (b) suggest further research to reject, elaborate and/or extend the conceptual framework" (p. viii).

There were two phases to this study. Phase one consisted of ethnographic interviews with eight middle and high school teachers. Phase two, conducted during the second year, consisted of systematic observations. Forty-eight teachers in four high schools were observed three times each over a two-month period. Results from both the exploratory and systematic observation phases of the study reaffirmed that teacher efficacy influences student achievement, and that teachers differed in their sense of efficacy.

Ashton and Webb's research design was not without flaws; therefore, the results must be interpreted with this in mind. Perhaps the biggest problem was the qualitative phase of the study. Ashton and Webb began their ethnographic interviews with predictive statements. Whereas predictive statements are appropriate for process-product research, they make the possibility of emergent findings slim in qualitative designs. Nevertheless, Ashton and Webb, did succeed in elaborating a conceptual framework for understanding teacher efficacy. In addition, they recommend that future studies continue following an ecological approach, that is taking into account the effects of the environment.

Acknowledging the importance of teacher efficacy and its relation to student achievement, Gibson and Dembo (1984) argue that the conceptualization and measurement of teacher efficacy is still imprecise. Their research was executed in three phases.

In phase one, utilizing factor analysis, the researchers attempted to: (a) articulate the dimensions of teacher efficacy and; (b) explore the relationship to Bandura's theory of self-efficacy. A Teacher Efficacy Instrument was developed which consisted of 30 Likert items. Two hundred eight elementary school teachers, with a range of teaching experience, participated in this

phase. The results suggest that teacher efficacy has many dimensions, including at least, minimal correspondence to Bandura's self-efficacy concept.

In phase two, the researchers utilized a multi-trait, multi-method analysis. They questioned whether: (a) efficacy collected from various sources in various ways converged; (b) efficacy could be distinguishable from other constructs. Fifty-five teachers, enrolled in a graduate program, took the Teacher Efficacy Scale. In addition, the teachers took a more open-ended questionnaire, which included 10 questions with teacher-related variables and 10 questions with external variables, such as parental involvement. Results suggest the distinction between teacher efficacy and other constructs, and validated the effectiveness of the Teacher Efficacy Scale to measure efficacy.

In phase three, the researchers focused on teacher behavior patterns between high and low efficacy teachers. Eight teachers were selected from the 208 who participated in phase one. A teacher-use-of-time measure, and questions-answers-feedback sequence, adapted from Brophy and Good (1973; cited in Gibson and Dembo, 1984) was used. Results indicated that the high efficacy teachers generally exhibited more teacher behaviors that corresponded to student achievement, such as, more time on academic task, and flexibility of classroom organization.

As a result of their research, Gibson and Dembo conclude that more research needs to be done to understand the dimensions of teacher efficacy. They specifically suggest research in the relationship between teachers' personality traits and their sense of efficacy.

Summary

As evidenced from the above, predominantly process-product studies, teacher efficacy appears to be related to student achievement. It follows then

that well-prepared teachers may be more effective with language-minority students. With the changing student population in this nation's public schools, the importance of teacher preparation and on-going teacher development that includes issues surrounding the education of linguistically and culturally diverse students can not be underestimated.

Mainstreaming Research

Mainstreaming research from the field of special education has focused mainly on student placement, academic achievement and social adjustment (MacMillan, Keogh and Jones, 1986). However, according to Schmelkin (1981) there is a growing awareness of the influence of the educational climate on special education students. Therefore, research has begun to address teacher and societal attitudes towards mainstreaming. The selection of studies for this section contains teacher attitudes and intervention studies. It is reemphasized that reviewing selected studies on mainstreaming does not imply that language-minority students are considered to be special education students.

Schmelkin (1981), interested in opinions about the academic costs of mainstreaming, and the socio-emotional costs of segregating handicapped students, investigated the attitudes of special education teachers, classroom teachers and non-teachers towards the mainstreaming of handicapped students. Schmelkin included non-teachers in her sample because she was critical of studies that had not examined attitudes towards mainstreaming by members of society outside of the education profession.

One hundred twenty participants from three groups (special education teachers, regular classroom teachers and non-teachers) comprised the sample. Schmelkin argued that the two groups of teachers were a representative sample, although she did not use probability sampling. The non-teacher

group, however, was not a representative sample. Using a Likert-style mainstreaming questionnaire developed by Schmelkin, the participants rated items that belonged to two subsets, the academic costs of mainstreaming, and the socio-emotional costs of segregating handicapped students.

Schmelkin found that teachers' attitudes towards mainstreaming are "complex and multifaceted" (p.46). More specifically, she discovered that special education teachers perceived the mainstreaming of special education students as less negative than regular teachers and non-teachers, overall and in terms of academic costs. On the other hand, Schmelkin found that in regards to the socio-emotional costs of mainstreaming, the three groups had similar attitudes. They understood the need for handicapped students to be mainstreamed. Schmelkin attributed similar attitudes to the attention in the media and the press regarding the needs of handicapped children.

Schmelkin concludes that in order to fully understand teacher attitudes, factors such as teachers' perceived ability to handle special education students and available teacher support systems must be considered.

In a one year intervention study, Larrivee (1981) investigated whether inservice teacher education would influence regular classroom teachers' attitudes towards the mainstreaming of special education students. Larrivee compared responses from three groups of regular K-12 classroom teachers. Group one teachers received no training in issues of special education. Group two teachers attended monthly inservice training during the school year. Teachers in group three participated in intensive inservice training during the school year.

General areas of behavior management, diagnosis, individualized instruction, and teaching and learning styles, served as content for both the moderate and intensive training models. The intensive training began with a

six week summer workshop and continued throughout the school year with weekly seminars. The moderate training model consisted of eight two-hour training sessions which were held each month.

An attitude scale was used to examine the attitudes of the three groups. Respondents indicated their degree of agreement to a number of statements. Not surprisingly, the group with intensive training had significantly more positive attitudes towards the mainstreaming of exceptional children than the other two groups. Differences were greatest on attitudes related to general philosophy of mainstreaming, social growth of the exceptional child, and the perceived ability of teachers to work effectively with special students.

From her research, Larrivee suggests that there are a number of variables involved in forming and changing teachers' attitudes, which include: (a) philosophy on mainstreaming; (b) classroom behavior of special education students; (c) classroom management; (d) perceived ability to teach special education students; (e) academic and social growth of special education students. Unless these variables are attended to, mainstreaming will fail. Larrivee concludes that teachers' attitudes towards mainstreaming are influenced by knowledge attainment, concept and skill acquisition, and experience with special education students. The influence of these factors on attitude is unclear. Along with training for regular classroom teachers, Larrivee advocates increased experience and contact with special students, and the availability of supportive personnel.

In another intervention study, Pernell, McIntyre and Bader (1985) studied how teachers perceived inservice instruction in issues of special education, and explored their attitudes toward mainstreaming policy. Twenty-two elementary and secondary teachers participated in a 30-hour, three-credit university course in mainstreaming which permitted teachers, among other

things, to discuss handicapped children, their concerns and perceptions. Before taking the course, their attitudes were assessed by a semantic differential scale which included three main aspects: (a) teaching exceptional children; (b) mainstreaming policy; (c) attending a course in special education. Each aspect was assessed for worth, involvement and success. The results of the semantic differential scale suggested that all of the participants had either negative or neutral attitudes towards mainstreaming.

The university course was taught by a special education professor with 12 years of experience. The course objectives included: (a) the creation of positive attitudes towards mainstreaming; (b) identification, diagnosis and classification of special students; (c) suggestions and strategies for working with exceptional students; (d) and use of ancillary and professional services. Along with participation in class, the participants were required to do class readings, write reaction papers after each session, and write a five page paper on mainstreaming at the end of the course. The reaction papers and participant diaries were used as additional data sources.

At the end of the course, teacher attitudes were rated again, and the attitudes had changed from mostly negative to positive. In addition, the reaction papers changed from expressions of hostility in the first weeks of class, to focus on the needs of the students during the fourth week of class, to questions and desire to apply skills learned at the end of the class. Even with more positive attitudes, the teachers doubted their ability to be successful with exceptional children in their own classrooms. Pernell, McIntyre and Bader interpret this to mean that a university course alone may change attitudes, but is not sufficient to change teacher perceptions of their abilities. The researchers suggest that until regular classroom teachers have direct

experience with exceptional children, their sense of efficacy will remain static.

Most recently, Davis-Clerk (1990) sought to understand the opinions of regular classroom teachers towards the mainstreaming of emotionally handicapped students in the regular classroom and to articulate the factors that influenced their opinions.

Three hundred elementary school teachers from six urban schools were surveyed. The survey consisted of three sections: self-report, opinion, and skills rating. Davis-Clerk found, that in general, classroom teachers are hesitant about working with emotionally handicapped students in the regular classroom. More specifically, she found that most teacher opinions were negative toward mainstreaming. But, first-year teachers seemed to have more positive attitudes than experienced teachers. Finally, those teachers who had received some type of education about emotionally handicapped children had more positive opinions towards mainstreaming. Based on an extensive review of the literature and the findings of her study, Davis-Clerk (1990) argues that

> there is a body of research which consistently demonstrates that as teachers learn more about disabled students and develop skills in satisfying their psychosocial and instructional needs, they display more positive attitudes towards mainstreaming. (p. 101)

Summary

Teacher attitudes, as seen from the above methodologically similar research contain a number of variables. Questions still abound as to which variables carry the most weight. Nevertheless, there is agreement that the manner in which the regular classroom teacher interacts with exceptional students is important.

From the intervention studies, it appears that attitudes can become more positive. Skill and concept acquisition and experience with exceptional

children seem to be necessary components for educational intervention. What is not known from these studies is the relationship between attitude change and classroom behavior change.

Related Research

In addition to the teacher beliefs, teacher expectations, teacher efficacy and mainstreaming literature, there are a few conceptually and methodologically related studies that informed this study. Thus far, qualitative studies which exclusively explore mainstream teachers' perceptions, practices and perceived needs of language-minority students have not been found.

Penfield (1987) looked at mainstream teachers' perspectives of ESL through an open-ended survey. Her study focused on the relationship between mainstream and ESL teachers, mainstream teachers' perceptions of language-minority students and their perceived training needs. A content analysis revealed five categories of responses: (a) programmatic setting and instruction; (b) training needs; (c) language-minority students and their parents; (d) peer interaction; (e) and role of the ESL teacher (p. 25). As in the results of many of the teacher expectation studies, Penfield found that mainstream teachers perceived students and their parents differently according to ethnic or national origin.

Along the lines of the teacher efficacy research, Penfield found that mainstream teachers "understood the need to improve academic learning for language-minority students, yet they appeared to have little knowledge in integrating content and L2 development" (p. 28). Finally, responses indicated that mainstream teachers know little about the role of the ESL teacher. Penfield attributes role misunderstanding as a major factor in the lack of communication between ESL and mainstream teachers. Penfield recommends

training for mainstream teachers and administrators and she concludes that ESL teachers could play a key role in such training.

More recently, Olsen and Mullen (1990) attempted to understand how effective mainstream teachers in California work with language-minority students. Thirty-six classroom teachers were interviewed and invited to participate in a follow-up retreat. The outcome of the retreat was a set of recommendations for regular classroom teachers with language-minority students. The recommendations include: (a) curricula that is created from student diversity; (b) classroom climate that is based on mutual respect and sets high expectations for all students; (c) environment that celebrates student diversity; (d) and instructional strategies that are based on cooperation, concept development, communication and critical thinking.

Although the Olsen and Mullen study employed qualitative methodology, there is some question about how much the researchers could learn from the classroom teachers in one two-hour interview and a follow-up retreat. This may be why the the study's recommendations are non specific.

Besides the Penfield (1987) and Olsen and Mullen (1990) study, ESL and bilingual research has virtually ignored the regular classroom teachers' perspective. Perhaps this can be attributed to distrust of the opposition, which frequently reduces second language research to ammunition for funding decisions of special language programs.

The final study has informed this inquiry both conceptually and methodologically. Enright (1986) did an ethnographic study of one former mainstream teacher who was interning as an ESL teacher. This descriptive study focused on how the teacher who had training in ESL methodology adapted the curriculum and teaching techniques to the variety of language abilities in her classroom. Enright used ethnographic research methods in

order to capture the complexity of verbal and nonverbal behavior that goes on in classrooms. In supporting his qualitative study design, Enright argues that "empirical conceptualization of the process of schooling has been severely over-simplified" (p. 155) through experimental research designs. The only way to really find out what is going on in a classroom is to describe occurrences in a naturalistic setting. Enright's description of the teacher intern affirms the complexities of classroom life and his study suggests that there is no one formula that is effective with language-minority students.

Summary

There is a wide range of educational alternatives for language-minority students. Influenced by the Bilingual Education Act, the Lau Remedies, and the social and political context of the school itself, some language-minority students are receiving quality education while others are not.

To date, much has been learned about teaching and learning by studying teacher behavior. However, the majority of the research in past decades, specifically teacher expectations, teacher efficacy, mainstreaming, and second-language, has been in the positivist tradition. In other words, studies have been driven by the researcher. What seems to be missing from the literature are studies which seek to understand the significance of actions from the point of view of the actors themselves; in this case, the mainstream teachers (Erickson, 1986). Insights from studying the beliefs, self-reported practices, and needs of mainstream teachers through a qualitative approach adds more depth to the existing body of knowledge.

Chapter III

Method

This study is based on the interpretive research paradigm since the purpose is to explore the points of view of three mainstream teachers as they educate language-minority students in the regular classroom. Case histories of the three teacher informants were written primarily from transcripts of in-depth interviews. In addition, audio tapes, notes from classroom observations and entries from teacher and researcher journals provided a secondary data source. The case histories were compared and contrasted through a cross-case analysis and related to the literature. Details of the research design, participant selection, data collection, analysis, and limitations follow.

Research Design

This inquiry is based on the interpretive research paradigm for three main reasons. First, according to Howe and Eisenhart (1990) regardless of paradigm, certain standards guide research. Among them are the research questions in that they drive the design. The research questions in this study focus on "issues of human choice and meaning" (Erickson 1986 p.121), in that they guide the researcher in attempting to understand the reality from the teachers' perspective. Understanding the perspective and meaning of those being studied is the heart of qualitative research and the point of this study.

Second, the qualitative paradigm is generative and constructive as opposed to verificative and enumerative (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984). Interpretive researchers explore natural settings, as opposed to examining

isolated bits of behavior. This type of exploration can lead to the development of grounded theory, one that is based from observation, description and real life. (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). To date, there are few studies that focus on the mainstream teacher in relation to language-minority students in natural settings; therefore, this exploratory study will be one of the first to generate constructs related to the mainstream teachers' perspective. The constructs, once identified, can be developed and studied further.

The third reason is based on the richness of data generated through qualitative study, and the researcher's experience as a teacher educator. Focusing on just three teachers yields more depth, greater understanding of the reality of these teachers, and greater insights into the challenges that these teachers face. Opportunities to talk superficially with mainstream teachers continue to occur during workshops and consultancies. However, in-depth exploration and observation does not usually happen spontaneously. It must be planned and teachers must be willing. This study was designed to provide data that reflects the perspectives of the teachers themselves.

Participant Selection

Because this study focused on three teachers, teacher selection was crucial, in that the richness of the data lies within the teacher participants. In other words, the beauty of in-depth study is exploring with, and describing experiences of teachers who are willing, have had experiences and are reflective and articulate. In addition, sampling in qualitative research is "purposeful" (Patton, 1990). The goal is to seek variation and to test developing constructs (Maxwell, 1992). Therefore, the selection process, consisting of a number of steps, began by throwing a large net.

First, 192 introductory letters and screening instruments (Appendices A and B) were sent to teachers K-12, in both urban and suburban schools. Teaching a range of subjects and grades, these initial 192 teachers were selected from the researcher's contacts as a consultant. Eighty-four screening instruments were returned for a return rate of 44%.

Second, returned screening instruments were initially separated into two categories, those willing to participate and those not. Fourteen teachers indicated their willingness to participate. From the teachers who were willing to participate, the responses were examined for: (a) ability to articulate beliefs, self-reported practices, and needs; (b) diversity of response; (c) diversity of grade level and school. The 14 potential participants were narrowed to 10; three resource room teachers and one music teacher were eliminated because of maternity leave and subject matter.

Third, the remaining 10 potential participants were contacted by phone for the purpose of confirming commitment to the study. Initial data was gathered from all 10 teachers by using the first 11 interview questions as a guide (Appendix C). Given the intensive nature of the data collection process, intuitive judgment was key for the final selection of three teacher informants.

Three teacher participants, Anita, Joshua, and Laura, and one alternative, Malka were selected based on responses from the screening instruments and the telephone interviews. (Pseudonyms have been used throughout this study). Anita, a fourth grade teacher in a suburban school, has been teaching for 20 years. Joshua is a 10th grade history and global studies teacher in an urban high school who has been teaching for five years. Laura, a first year teacher, is teaching fifth grade in an urban elementary school. Malka, who teaches first grade in an urban elementary school, has been in the classroom for 16 years.

Malka was chosen as the alternative because of her grade level. Because of the nature of second language development, and the increased demands of the mainstream classroom on language-minority students in the upper grades, there was more interest in studying upper elementary and high school teachers. Nevertheless, since data collection spanned a five month period, an alternative participant was a necessary precaution.

Data Collection

The data collection techniques for this study consisted primarily of in-depth, semi-structured interviews over a five-month period. In addition, classroom observation notes and audio tapes provided context, and teacher and researcher journal entries affirmed and clarified interview data.

Pilot Study

Formal and informal pilot work was essential to the conception of the study, development of the screening instrument and questionnaire and execution of the interviews.

Before mailing, the screening instruments were reviewed by two mainstream teachers, grades eight and four, and one ESL teacher. Suggestions resulted in an easier format, to which teachers could respond with as little effort as possible.

Topics and questions from the interview schedule emerged from the literature, the researcher's personal experience as a teacher and teacher educator and consultation with experts and colleagues (Appendix E). The interview schedule was formally reviewed by Dr. Joyce Penfied, Rutgers University, and one mainstream teacher. Penfield's research and experience with issues of second language development and mainstream teachers inspired

questions 12, 14, 15, 20 and 28. The mainstream teacher affirmed that, if asked, she could answer all questions.

A pilot interview, lasting two hours was conducted with Trixie, an urban kindergarten teacher, who had eight language-minority students in her class. The purpose of the pilot interview was to check the interview questions for clarity and appropriateness, gain experience in the interview process (probes and questions) and begin to make sense of the data.

Trixie was asked the interview questions that pertained directly to language-minority students (numbers 11-20, 24 and 28). The interview was tape recorded. The questions were apparently clear and they seemed to stimulate Trixie. At the end of the interview she was asked to read the remaining interview questions for clarity and appropriateness, and to make comments or suggestions about any aspect of the study.

Trixie's main suggestions dealt with organization. She suggested that the interviewer guide the teacher at the onset of the interview in describing the language-minority students in an orderly fashion, especially when there are as many as eight language-minority students in one class. There was some confusion, stemming from the interview questions, when Trixie tried to sort out the language-minority students in her class. As a result of the pilot work, time was taken to learn about each language-minority student during the actual data collection. By doing this, the researcher exhibited genuine interest, and was able to probe more effectively about the the teacher participants' viewpoints towards each language-minority student.

In order to make sense of the pilot data, the interview tape and written notes were reviewed three times. One aspect of interest that resulted from the pilot interview is related to the literature and the researcher's experience. Throughout the interview Trixie asked a lot of questions, expressed doubt, and

openly admitted that she did not know very much about language-minority students. For example, when Trixie was asked to describe her language-minority students (question 11), she was not sure where some of them were from or what languages they spoke.

In another example, Trixie was asked about which programmatic approach was most effective for educating language-minority students (question 12). After describing what she thought ESL and bilingual programs were, she repeatedly asked questions and raised doubt.

> I don't know what goes on in pull-out, I think I might know but I'm not sure, I have no idea. Do they practice sight words?

In another example, when asked about incidents that stand out with language-minority students (question 14), Trixie began with doubt about individual students.

> I wish I could do more to help her (language-minority student) I wish I could make her feel better. I wish I had more knowledge on how to make students communicate.

Trixie's doubts and questions relate directly to the teacher efficacy literature and the researcher's experience as a a teacher educator. Many teachers rely on intuition when working with language-minority students and this seems to be disturbing to them. There appears to be some unarticulated skills and knowledge that mainstream teachers perceive that they need to know to be effective. It is the intent of this study to try and identify those unarticulated skills and knowledge. Teacher educators and staff developers will be much better equipped to work with mainstream teachers in issues of educating language-minority students in the regular classroom if they can draw on or begin with the knowledge and experiences that mainstream teachers already possess.

Interviews, Observations, and Journals

Three mainstream teachers (and one alternative) each participated in five, two-hour, open-ended, semi-structured interviews during the winter of 1991. Each teacher was interviewed once a month for five months. In other words, interview one occurred in February, interview two took place in March, interview three occurred in April, interview four occurred in May, and interview five occurred in June. The first four interviews began with an interview schedule (Appendix C) which served as a starting point; however, interviews were informant driven as opposed to researcher driven (Spradley, 1987). The teacher participants had the freedom to deviate from the interview schedule. In fact, the teacher participants frequently began each interview with something that occurred or what was on their minds. The fifth interview consisted of general open-ended questions to clarify existing data (Appendix D).

In addition to the five interviews, two classroom observations occurred before the second and third interviews. The purpose of the classroom observations was to provide context, and to elicit potential interview questions. Observations focused on: (a) interactions between the teacher and language-minority student(s); (b) instructional strategies and language-minority student(s) reaction to instructional strategies. The classes were audio taped, and reviewed before the next interview. The classroom observations added authenticity to the interview questions as the researcher was able to comment intelligently about the teacher participants' classrooms and show an informed interest in the issues that were important to the teacher participants.

In addition, the teacher participants were asked to keep a journal for the purpose of learning what they were thinking about during the course of the study. The journals were collected at the end of each interview session and

examined before the subsequent interview session. Although the teacher participants did not write consistently throughout the course of the study, their reflections provided an added dimension to the data base. Their written reflections most often consisted of anecdotes or reminders of something they wanted to share during the next interview.

Finally, researcher notes during the interviews and observations, and a reflective journal were kept during the data collection process for the purpose of documenting non-verbal cues, perceptions and questions. The journal entries helped to identify and articulate researcher bias (Lemberger, 1990).

Transcription Process

Although the tapes were listened to after each interview session, the transcription process did not begin until all of the interviews were completed. Interviews were taped and transcribed in order to have a retrievable data source which contained the words and phrases of the teacher participants.

Writing the Case Histories

Three case histories, presented in chapter four, are organized around the topics from the interview schedule and are written directly from the transcripts. The teacher participants' experiences take the form of direct quotes and narrative vignettes to insure authenticity (Erickson, 1986). Authenticity of voice is the goal of the case histories. In other words, only the perspectives of the teacher participants are included in chapter four.

Validity and Reliability

Questions of validity and reliability frequently accompany interpretive research. These concepts must be considered against a qualitative backdrop and cannot be based on positivistic or traditional definitions (Maxwell, 1992;

Howe and Eisenhart, 1990; Merriam, 1988; Erickson, 1986). In other words, traditional definitions of validity and reliability that have emerged from quantitative research do not necessarily fit.

Internal validity, according to Goetz and LeCompte (1984) and Merriam (1988) is the extent to which one's findings match reality. Ratcliff (1983 cited in Merriam, 1988) clarifies the concept through "notions of validity" (p.167) arguing that if interpretive design is based on a reality that is dynamic, one's findings can never be matched.

There are a number of strategies that were used to check internal validity (Merriam, 1988). First, triangulation was used by collecting data through multiple sources; transcriptions of in-depth interviews, audio tapes and notes of classroom observations, and entries of teacher and researcher journals.

Secondly, member checks, giving data and interpretations of data to the informants for constant review, was employed before the start of each interview. In addition, each teacher participant reviewed their written case history for accuracy. Third and related to the previous strategy is participatory modes of research. This strategy involved the participants in all stages of the research from eliciting potential interview questions to providing input for the final report. The fourth strategy to check internal validity is peer examinations. Throughout the study the researcher asked colleagues to comment on the interpretations and findings.

Finally, through journal writing and peer examinations, subjectivity and bias were clarified. According to Lemberger (1990), subjectivity can be thought of as a lens within which the data and interpretation of the data is viewed. It must be emphasized that employing the above strategies is merely a check for internal validity. According to Lambert (1981 cited in Feiman-

Nemser and Floden, 1986) the "researcher ultimately forms the concepts that guide analysis" (p. 507).

Reliability, traditionally defined, is not applicable to qualitative research since qualitative research is not seeking to isolate patterns of human behavior (Maxwell, 1992; Merriam, 1988). However, Lincoln and Guba (1985) argue that interpretive research is reliable in terms of method, not outcome. For example, if an interpretive study is conceptually sound, implemented and written well, other researchers should be able to replicate the method if it is applicable to their research questions. In this sense, then, this study is methodologically reliable.

External validity, the degree to which findings can be generalized, is inappropriate to interpretive research (Erickson 1986). Therefore, no claims on external validity in the positivistic sense are made from this study for two reasons. First, there are only three informants and they are not representative of all mainstream teachers with language-minority students. In fact, they were chosen to represent the range of human experience. Second, as the interpretive paradigm is based on social interaction and meaning, generalizing is impossible since interactions and meaning are never exactly duplicated.

Analysis of the Cases

In one sense data analysis began with the first interview and continued throughout the data collection process. According to Spradley (1979) researchers must begin writing early and continuously because writing aids analysis. Writing provided insights, made relationships explicit and generated questions pertinent to the study (Spradley, 1979). As the interviews and

observations progressed, tapes were listened to continuously for similar and dissimilar issues and experiences.

The analysis, which is found in chapter five, consists of cross-case comparisons. Complementary and contrary experiences between the teacher participants themselves, the literature and the researcher's experiences are included. Chapter six contains conclusions and implications for practice and research.

Limitations

There are a number of limitations that need to be emphasized in order to fully understand the significance of the study. First, because of the small sample size and the nature of qualitative design, generalizing the findings is not a goal of this study. According to Yin (1984), generalizability in qualitative research applies to the generation of theory as opposed to the application of findings to larger teacher populations. Findings from this study can be applied to the development of grounded theory.

A second limitation to this study lies within trying to "get inside teachers' heads" (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986 p. 506). Asking teachers about their beliefs, self-reported practices, and needs does not necessarily comprise the whole of the teachers' perspective. Sharp and Green (1975) argue that merely describing one's point of view disregards unconscious behaviors and actions, and is one of the limits of interpretive research.

Moreover, Spradley (1979) maintains the importance of understanding the informant's language. Even though the interviews were conducted in both the researcher's and informants' native language "the researcher must recognize the existence of subtle but important language differences" (Spradley, 1979 p. 19). Nevertheless, this study aims to provide a forum for

mainstream teachers as they begin to describe their beliefs, self-reported practices and needs as they educate language-minority students.

The third and final limitation has to do with the role of the researcher which can be characterized as both an insider and outsider (in relation to the informants who are mainstream teachers). The conception of this study was based on the researcher's experience as a teacher and teacher educator; therefore, the researcher had somewhat of an insider's view. This inside view, based on experience with language-minority students contributed to certain biases that were inherent to this study. As mentioned previously, bias can be thought of as the filter from which the data was interpreted. Through the researcher's reflective journal, bias remained explicit throughout the study.

On the other hand, the researcher was also a doctoral student, which could be considered an outside position. According to Lemberger (1990) teachers may be cautious with outsiders, due to lack of trust. The teacher participants' spontaneous phone calls to the researcher during the course of the study indicated, however, that trust had been established.

In the next chapter, the case histories of Anita, Joshua and Laura are presented. Organized around the topics from the interview schedule, the case histories are written directly from the transcipts to insure authenticity of voice.

Chapter IV

Narrative Case Studies

This chapter presents the case histories of three regular classroom teachers with language-minority students. It is the goal of this chapter to present the case histories as accurately as possible, assuring the authenticity of the teachers' voice. Anita, a 40 year old classroom veteran with 20 years teaching experience, teaches fourth grade in a suburban elementary school. Joshua, 27, teaches 9th and 10th grade global studies and history in an urban high school. He has been teaching for six years. Laura, 27, teaches fifth grade in an urban elementary school. This is her first year in the classroom. The names of the teachers and language-minority students have been changed to assure anonymity. After describing each teacher's personal and professional background, each case covers current teaching context, language-minority students, self-reported instructional practices and professional development and support.

Anita

Anita was born into a blue collar family in Queens, New York. Her father, a war veteran, "wanted to move to the suburbs and do the right thing," hence the family moved to Long Island when she was five. Anita went through grade school, high school and college on Long Island. In fact, she has never really left the Island as that is where she, her husband and three children currently live.

Anita's parents were not college educated. Because of this, she was "always directed toward higher education." She wanted to go to college, but felt that career choices for women were limited.

> I was still from a generation where the women's lib movement hadn't really started so there were a lot of social stigmas put on what kinds of things women could be educated to do, and I suppose to be anything other than a teacher ... I knew I wanted to go to school, to get a college education, but there really weren't that many options open to the female population at that time. You sort of became a teacher or a nurse.

Teaching seemed desirable to Anita. She "enjoyed babysitting in high school, and not having any brothers or sisters, it seemed like fun to work with children." Hence, after high school, with teaching in mind, she got an Associate Degree in Education, nursery through sixth, at Nassau Community College. At Nassau, she took mostly education and psychology courses because she did not want to focus on science and math. Anita thought that psychology might open additional career options later. Upon graduating at Nassau, Anita continued her education at Molloy College where she received a BS in Psychology in 1973. Her decision to major in psychology and minor in education was because she "knew there were no teaching jobs available to graduates with education degrees." Students at Molloy "were encouraged to take studies in a more specified area, with a minor in education." Anita eventually went on to get a Master's Degree in Reading and Learning Disabilities from Adelphi University.

Anita has been teaching for almost 20 years, but five years ago her career changed when she moved from private to public school. Her reasons for moving into public education were predominantly financial.

> I really made a career move because I taught for 14 years in a private (Catholic) school. And now I'm in a public school system which is a whole new ball game.

From her experience, Anita believes that there are differences between private and public school teaching. One of the differences is pay.

> There is a big pay difference. I was making more as a half day kindergarten teacher here (public), then I made teaching full time in private (Catholic) school.

Another difference between teaching in public and private school is the status given from the state, administrators and fellow teachers.

> According to the state department of education, the people who teach in private school are not considered teachers, because it doesn't count toward anything. When I got my masters you don't submit a certificate of qualification unless you are teaching in a public setting. So in addition to finances, there is that philosophy out there, even with the administrators of the private schools, you're not really teachers. Even by your fellow teachers, you go to a conference with public school teachers ... I somehow got the impression that there is a difference that you really aren't doing the same thing.

Finally, Anita asserts that private school teachers work harder than public school teachers. "They don't get lunch hours, they don't get prep periods, they don't have contracts like public school teachers."

Generally, Anita is glad that she has made the switch from private to public school teaching because public school teaching provides more professional opportunities. "There is more professionalism, exposure to educationally new ideas." Nevertheless, Anita is not sure where she will be in the next five years. She enjoys teaching, but because of the day to day demands and stress, she does not "know if she will survive."

Current Teaching Context

For the past five years Anita has been teaching at a small suburban elementary school "of no more than five hundred students." The school contains one kindergarten class which is split into morning and afternoon sessions. There are three first grade classes, three second grade classes and two classes each in grades three through six. According to Anita, "the children are heterogeneously grouped in classroom setting according to socialization skills and ability."

Anita describes the majority of the families in her school as "typically suburban, middle class....blue collar type workers. There are a few professionals, individual businessmen." Most of the students live in "single family dwellings." However, the number of families who rent is increasing.

Anita believes that 75% to 85 % of the school population is white. The remaining 25% is a mix of African-American, Latino, Asian and Middle Eastern students.

> There is a small element of the population, I believe, now I'm not one hundred percent sure, but I think many of our Hispanic speaking children are Salvadoran. They seem to have gathered in the community... We have some Orientals from different countries in the Orient. We have a few Middle Easterner [sic] populations, Afghanistani [sic] Indian.

Anita observes some differences between the non-Latino and Latino language-minority students in her school in regard to English-language proficiency.

> I find that many of them (the non-Latino students) are not part of the ESL program, because they are fluent in English. For whatever reason, they arrive at school fluent in English. They do contribute to the general population of the classroom.

In addition, Anita believes that some grade levels have more "foreign kids than others."

> Some grade levels seem to have a little more foreign kids than others.I've noticed, and I really couldn't give you any figures .... There may be a compilation of that information. It seems to me that the sixth grades tend to get a lot of ethnic people during the year which is unusual. The class will be set for several years up to sixth grade, then we get a few added ethnic children.

She speculates why this is so.

> It is interesting because I think that a lot of people who may be from Long Island or the city are not familiar with the system of schooling. But they (non-white population) know the sixth year is the end. They might hold off to make a move until a child.... that's just an observation. I don't really have facts and figures, but I see it happening a lot. I see a lot more children coming in sixth grade.

There are about 30 teachers and support staff at Anita's school. Anita believes that there are at least two or three other teachers who began their

teaching careers in Catholic school. According to Anita, the school staff is almost exclusively white with the exception of one teacher, who is " Cuban, not Hispanic, so I really wouldn't consider her.... so we really don't have any ethnic background teachers."

Because of her personality, Anita feels that she receives a fair amount of support in her work. But, she believes that not all staff members receive the support that they merit.

> I am not an aggressive type person, I don't buck the system. My philosophy is that you accomplish a lot more with sugar than with vinegar. So I find it to be supportive. There are professionals on the staff who I respect as professionals. I don't always find that they are given the support that they should be given.

Moreover, due to contractual disputes she senses that the community's perceptions of teachers are not necessarily positive.

> For the most part I find that now because of some contractual things that have happened between the school district and the administration and the teachers union, there seems to be some negativism towards the teachers. The word has been out that we are overpaid and under worked.

Personally, Anita feels that she has good relations with most of the parents in the school.

> I could go to any parent and pretty much they would be willing to at least listen, sit down and discuss with me. They may not always agree with me, but that is fine.

There is a high level of parental involvement in the school and Anita has volunteered to serve as a liaison between the parents and teachers in the school.

> I have volunteered my services to kind of direct that desire to come in and assist with the intentions of hoping to get more academic assistance. Parents come in and do all kinds of things. We have a volunteer lunch program. They order out pizza every Thursday and they have McDonald Days once a month. They really want to get involved with, the teachers think well, it's like fun and games. I think that what is needed is some person in between to direct this kind of stuff.

Despite the parental involvement, there is some friction between the parents and the teachers over the kinds of programs that the PTA sponsors in the school.

> Now we have this atmosphere where the PTA is doing all this wonderful stuff and everybody is getting all these awards. I'm sure that these things are just as important to the school, they really are. Kids need to know there is a nice lunch coming at lunchtime, that's important to children. That makes their day. But I find that the teachers have this outlook, that here comes the PTA, what kind of games are we going to play. Maybe we could pull some of the academic and play activities together.

Anita provides an example where the activities of the PTA and instructional practices of the teachers are in conflict.

> There is a breakfast activity that is supposed to be the culmination of the growing healthy unit and the breakfast consists of pancakes, sausages and eggs. Some of us realize that that isn't so healthy. So those are the kinds of things. We are very much involved in the growing healthy curriculum which is undermined by the lunch program which is McDonald's hotdogs and pizza [sic]. So there are like some dual messages.

Anita compares the outside community to one of Aesop's fables and she believes that at some point there must be people who will speak up for quality education.

> The message is that I think it is like Aesop's fable of the man, the donkey and the boy. We have a community here where the man is getting off the donkey, the boy is getting on and soon we're going to be carrying the donkey. It's just I think that somewhere down the line we're going to have to have some people who are willing to take a stand for education.

According to Anita, it is difficult to describe a typical day in her class because of all of the special programs. "I have never seen so much coming and going in my life." To exemplify, Anita describes a typical Monday schedule where she has the class for only 25 minutes the entire morning.

> Monday mornings, 20 out of 23 children go to chorus with me from 9:00 to 9:40. At 9:40 to 10:20 we go to the library. At 10:25 to 11:20 we go to gym. At 11:00 to 11:25 I have them. Then they go to lunch.

Anita has her class for almost two hours on Tuesdays, but the time is broken up between special classes.

> Tuesday morning we have computer at 9:05 to 9:40 ..... Tuesdays are the days that we have some children that are not in the computer room because they go to Great Books. Then at 10:25 we go to gym again.

Wednesday, Anita's class starts with gym at 9:05. When they return at 9:40 she has them for the rest of the morning. Thursday, Anita has the entire class all morning "except for the six or eight children that are leaving at various times from 9:00 until lunch for music." Friday, is as "disjointed as Monday." In fact, Anita believes that on Mondays she could stay at home. "I'm a baby sitter. Monday morning they really don't need me."

With Great Books, computers, orchestra, chorus, gym, ESL, library, and resource room, Anita finds that she must be "very aware of who is coming and going in the classroom" for all these activities. She copes by "doing a lot of flexible scheduling." Anita never used to use a plan book but she finds that with such a schedule, it is necessary.

> I never used a plan book so much. We used to kind of write the plans out and they would stay in my mind. Now I find myself constantly going back to see what it is that I really want to key on so that I can do that in the time that I have all the children together.

Despite the fact that Anita considers herself a skilled and flexible teacher, she questions her ability to teach effectively because her students are constantly coming in and out of the class.

> I sometimes think that they are out of the classroom too much and it takes a real flexible teacher to be able to fill in the gaps. I mean I could, there are teachers who, math is at eight o'clock and it doesn't matter .... that's the way they work. I would like to work that way, I think that it is probably the best way to work, and the most efficient. But it's impossible. You can't. You can't be teaching your science lesson when only two thirds of your class is there. You have to be realistic.

It is a personal challenge to keep herself organized as well.

> How to make that routine even for myself so that I can be organized. I find that if I set the routine down, and I make myself stick to it,

> it is easier for me. It doesn't necessarily have to be the same content everyday.

Moreover, she questions the impact of this type of schedule on her students.

> Because often times what happens is that I no sooner get started on getting kids who have just gotten into writing something down on paper, after a classroom discussion, they have to leave. In fact, when it is totally out of their mind, it's hard to bring them back. I think that they could lose many good ideas. I also think that children really need routine .... a lot of them need the stability of the classroom. I find it really difficult to provide that in this classroom for them.

Anita believes that student security is important in that "it makes them feel self-confident, they know what to expect." With this schedule, it is almost impossible for students to know what to expect.

> When yesterday at 9:00 we did this and today at 9:00 we do something else. It's hard for them. Especially if they are non-English speaking. You know you come in and you spend a week, and the very next week is not going to be anything like the previous week.

In addition to the numerous special programs, Anita believes that her district is "heavy on curriculum." For example Anita teaches a "Growing Healthy Curriculum, A child abuse curriculum, The New York State Science Curriculum and a Latin curriculum" to name a few. Between the special programs and the curricula Anita expresses frustration.

> Sometimes I feel that I would like to be the one to make the choice. But I don't want to be the only one that feels this way .... There's just so much and you find yourself racing like a robot from one place to another.

Despite the special programs and the curricula Anita describes her planning process as "ongoing" and although she has to submit lesson plans she does that at the end of the week.

> Unofficially, I'm always planning. I'm thinking ahead of what has to be done. Accumulating materials, developing programs, those kinds of things are ongoing planning. Actual lesson plans that I write down to submit, I really do them at the end or towards the end of the week.

Anita does not mind the fact that she has to submit lesson plans.

> It's not a problem for me, I work well under pressure. You, know

> that's just my style. If you tell me I must have this done, I will be able to do it. It kind of gives me some structure. If somebody looks at it, I'm a product of this regimented kind of program. If somebody looks at it and initials it that will make me feel good.

Anita's fourth graders are students "with a wide range of abilities."

> I have three you would call gifted. Children that really qualify for the gifted program. Then I have several above average children, reading way above grade level. I have a small group of children who are reading three years below grade level. I have one child who is supposed to be in a self-contained special education class. Then I have some rather average kids. Not anything special.

Anita believes that "all the students in her class are special," but two students in particular stand out. Nancy clearly stands out from the rest because of her motor coordination. "I have never seen a more uncoordinated funny little child." Anita describes this child as one that "screams out for lots of attention." Furthermore, she suffers from allergies and "she has a problem breathing so she sometimes makes a lot of noises." According to Anita the other students, "really dislike her ... she's really a mess." Anita is considering referring her to the school support team. This team "consists of the gym teacher, the school nurse, the principal, the psychologist, the resource room teacher, and the speech teacher." The effectiveness of the team depends on its members and the persistence of the classroom teacher.

> We have a meeting and we talk about the things I see in the classroom and they make some recommendations. I come with my folder and my test scores and my observations and I kind of tell them about her history, what I've seen. They make suggestions ... If it's a good team everything will be taken care of. If the problems are so great that somebody has to take notice, probably something will happen. If you have an in between situation, there is more required of the classroom teacher to keep after the team, and to make decisions or do testing.

Ravi, another of Anita's students, stands out for different reasons than Nancy. English is his second language although he is not pulled out for ESL. Anita feels he is "a very bright little boy." She describes a bit of his background.

> This little boy, he goes to India every summer. His parents are from India and his grandparents still live there. I'm not quite sure what denomination, and when of course he goes back and spends vacation with his relatives in his native country he reverts to the native language. I'm not sure (what language they speak) there are so many dialects there, but anyway he is a brilliant boy. He has a wonderful mind, he has a good grasp of the English language, but there are certain things that I find are idiosycranatic [sic] about the language that he will misinterpret.

Anita contends that her class is progressing "slowly" this year. She feels that many of her students have not grasped some of the basic skills. She draws upon her remedial reading experience.

> I find that this population here is somewhat slower, myself working slower. This particular group isn't slow but there are a few that are slowing us down. I also find myself using some of my remedial reading experience, my MA in learning how to deal with remedial reading children, they say don't assume anything. I find that true with just the general population. Even the gifted. They think they know but they don't. I find that I have to teach them basic student type skills. Like many people say, you shouldn't have to do that in fourth grade. But you have to do it.

In addition to basic skills, Anita thinks that her students need to learn organizational skills.

> Common sense type things, like we deal with your notebook. How to prepare for a test. I really think that a lot of teachers assume that the kids know how to do these things. What happens is that teachers get bogged down with the content and they forget to point out to the children the reason that we are doing this in spelling or writing down notes for science.

Anita maintains that the system depends more on the success of teachers and she refers to the one room schoolhouse to make her point.

> These people (one room schoolhouse teachers) had to deal with a room full of children from all over the place, from K to whatever, I don't know how far they went up to. And they had to do the best that they could. But there wasn't anybody watching over them or telling them what to do. They had to do this and they had to accomplish that. They must have made up there own ways of doing things.

Moreover, Anita believes that all children can learn something and that specialists can play a role in helping find alternative methods.

> My personal philosophy is that children have their own learning

> styles. If we are lucky enough to be able to get enough specialists in the area to give us some input what may be some alternative ways of teaching things to certain children that have certain kinds of stigmas to learning different material we might be able to come up with being able to teach everybody something.

Anita believes that "everybody is failing" in school because we are neglecting to look at children as individuals.

> I think that it is because we have these boxes. There are the boxes of grades and the boxes of kids and teacher profiles of the children. They (the children) are all different and should be looked at differently.

To emphasize her point, Anita shares her reaction to an article in the newspaper that looked at bilingual verses pull-out programs.

> My reaction to any of that is that we can not take any children, any group, whether they be ESL or below average readers or whatever. You have to look at the child. Look at what is going on in the child's life. Look at what kind of learning experiences they have come from and what kind of intelligence they possess.

In meeting the needs of all children, Anita feels that IQ has been underutilized.

> I think that we should have a little better picture of what their IQ is. I think more teachers should be trained in that aspect. If there is potential they should be taught, or at least encouraged to learn. Kids who have low average intelligence definitely need specialized kinds of teaching. I'm not saying that they can't learn. They have different needs. They may not be able to be handled by the teacher who has this curriculum and who is locked into these programs ... three weeks of multiplication, three weeks of division and then we move on.

Finally, in order for all kids to learn, Anita feels it is the program that should fit the students, not the students plugged into the program. "The children are being made to fit the program and that's not what we should be doing."

In conclusion, Anita's current teaching position in a small suburban elementary school is different from her 15 years experience teaching in a suburban Catholic school. She feels supported in her work, but there is friction between the parents, administration, greater community and the teachers. A typical day for Anita is frequently fragmented as her school has a

variety of special programs for the students. Moreover, Anita has a number of special curricula to follow. Anita has a range of abilities in her fourth grade class. She believes that all children are special and have the ability to learn, although not all learn in the same way. She is concerned that schools have become too programmed at the expense of individual students needs.

Language-Minority Students

Anita has 23 students in her fourth grade class this year. Two students, Luz and Rosa, are classified as language-minority since they are pulled out for ESL everyday.

Luz.

Anita has known Luz for five years. In fact, it was Anita's kindergarten class that Luz entered mid way through the school year. When she arrived four years ago, "she was placed in a first grade class, but the teacher said that she had no language skills." Since the school was "not sure of her chronological age" and suspicious about the personal information provided by her aunt, she was put into Anita's class. Anita describes her at that time as "a tiny child... very very anxious to please type little girl." Anita remembers Luz as a kindergarten student.

> Now there is something about this child, it seems as if she was a very good adapter. She seemed to have a lot going for her, she gave the appearance of being a bright child. Let's put it that way, she is able to adapt, she's able to compensate. She had no language but she was able to do a lot of things in the classroom. She was a good follower. She could follow what the other children were doing. She was interested. She had a real desire to learn, and to this day, school is her favorite place in the world.

According to the art teacher, originally from Cuba, who served as the school's interpreter, Luz's Spanish was not developed in kindergarten.

> We're fortunate, we have an art teacher who came to this country

> as a young girl. She speaks fluent Spanish. She is often an interpreter for us during conferences and speaking with the children when they are upset. It seems that most children, even if they have good English skills, revert to the native language if there is a problem. She (the art teacher) would be the one to tell me that she was having trouble understanding Luz's Spanish and this was in kindergarten.

In spite of the fact that Anita maintained that Luz's native language skills were not fully developed, Anita "found her to be very quick." Anita felt that Luz would succeed in school.

> She was picking up the language, I thought that was a good sign. She was doing well in math. I thought to myself, this kid is going to be alright. She's going to be one of our success stories.

Anita believes that Luz is from El Salvador but she is "not sure of all the circumstances that she came under." She does know that part of Luz's family was left behind in El Salvador and she believes that Luz has lived with her aunt's family since she arrived. Anita has briefly met Luz's guardians. She describes Luz's family members and their perceptions towards the community.

> From what I understand the aunt is really a sister. It's either her sister or her mother's sister. I'm not really sure. And the man that she calls daddy is in fact that woman's husband. And then there is a little boy of those two parents who she refers to as her brother. He's in first grade now. She considers him her brother, which is relatively natural in that situation. And they seem to be very concerned and very interested except that the father has expressed to many people, especially the ESL teachers, that they feel that the the community does not like Hispanics.

Anita attributes feelings of prejudice to the fact that Luz's family is not proficient in English.

> I think that it's more a matter that they feel uncomfortable having to confer.... He (Luz's guardian) seems to have this idea that people are not really helpful to Hispanics and I doubt, I'm not really sure that they are literate in their own language.

Furthermore, Anita believes that insufficient services in the community for families like Luz's might also cause perceptions of prejudice.

> He works as a mechanic. And really nice hardworking people, I think that they are concerned. I just don't think that there is enough help for them. I think that's part of the problem with these kinds of

> children. There is not enough for the families to make the language barrier less of a problem.

Anita acknowledges the fact that there is segregation in her community.

> In our particular setting here, they seem to feel segregated much more so than in an urban area, I think. They seem to be dispersed between area of Westbury and Hicksville. They are all renting and the rest of the population is homeowners, single family dwellings. And I think that it can be kind of awkward.

Moreover, Anita admits that there is prejudice in her community and it manifests itself in complaints about the ESL program.

> I feel that most of the people are concerned and helpful. There are those in the community who are definitely prejudiced against these people.... really object to the ESL program. We had a few people speak at school board meetings because an ESL teacher did a grant, a trip a month program and some of the people went wild. 'If you can do for those kids why doesn't the whole class go on a trip, it's not fair.'

Anita understands this conflict along with some of the other teachers in the school and she explains the difficulties for her non-ESL students.

> And even some other teachers and I must admit that I can understand it as a teacher. It is very difficult to deal with 20 other students when two or three of your students are going on these wonderful trips, and come back with all kinds of paraphernalia. Then it becomes Gee, I want to be in ESL too.' That's the nature of the beast. It's difficult for the children in the regular classes. Although they don't have the understanding that these children (language-minority) don't get to go all these places with their family, where our children do.

In addition, Anita expresses her conflicts as a teacher in this situation.

> You don't understand what it is like when these children arrive back in my room with candy, or whatever it is. The commotion that it causes. Then you have this one wants it [sic]. It's those things that really...

Despite the friction with classroom teachers and the fact that the non-ESL students want to be in ESL, Anita believes that,

> Luz wants terribly to be one of the regular children ... She doesn't want to be singled out. She wants to be one of these kids. She doesn't want to be labeled ESL. And they love her. This is a particularly nice school. These kids, I have to say they are just very good to each other.

Furthermore, according to Anita, Luz's home situation contributes to the fact that she wants to be like the rest of the children in the school.

> She does not like going to ESL for two reasons. One, she doesn't like the idea of being singled out. In other words she wants to be like everyone else. And I think that is probably a lot stronger because I get those vibes from the home situation. Her daddy feels that people don't like Spanish people. I think that is filtered down to her as well. She wants to say, 'no I'm not an ESL child.' They all seem to know this label now.

Anita finds that even the "PTA ladies" know what ESL is. She reflects on her teaching experience in Catholic school and decides that economics plays a role.

> I mean in the schools all the PTA ladies know what ESL is. I find that kind of interesting because in other communities, people don't have any idea what ESL is. I taught in Catholic school. ESL, what is that. It's interesting here. I think that it is also because the socio-economic thing related to this. It's very different out here. And it is more so that some of these people (the community) feel this is an unnecessary burden.

Furthermore, there is a perception that the ESL students and their families are not part of the community.

> They are renting people, they are not part of the regular community. They don't attend school functions. They don't come to fund raising. Most of them don't participate in fund raising. So that the other people (the community) perceive this as a burden. People who tend to be the ESL population perceive the other people as being white racists.

Anita perceives the situation as "a lack of understanding and communication" mainly on the part of the school community. Moreover, she maintains that there is not enough community support for these families.

> They (the community) don't know what these people have been through. They (the community) don't know how hard some of these people are struggling to make it. And I don't think that there is support to help them become a viable part of the community. Or at least the school community. Because that is where they have to fit in and their kids have to fit in. And then (the community) gets the impression that some of these people don't want to, for their own reasons.

Not only is there a lack of community support, but there is a lack of school support due to the district's "austerity budget." Anita gives an example of how this has effected Luz.

> It just horrifies me that a social worker is not involved in some way with our schools having an ESL population. There are certain things that now we are on an austerity budget. This kid (Luz) has a real problem and her family has a real problem getting back and forth to school. I have uncles coming from gas stations, coming in all kinds of vehicles covered with grease. Her dad comes, or this person that she calls dad comes. He is covered from head to toe with grease. They have a problem with transportation. We are on an austerity budget. Sometimes he is very very late. They have a problem, there are no buses. When we had buses, Luz was never late. She was always here on time, she always made the bus and she got home.

As previously mentioned, Anita had high expectations for Luz when she was in her kindergarten class; however, now that Luz in in fourth grade, the situation has changed. According to Anita, Luz is falling behind in her school work. She is in the lowest reading group and "she is not catching on to this language, she's not getting the reading."

> She (Luz) is below (grade level). She'll pass but we have an unwritten lower standard for ESL children ... having no retention policy. It doesn't matter whether she passes or not ... You can fail, but you can't be retained. So what does it matter?

Anita suspects that Luz might be experiencing other problems besides academic ones, because

> she doesn't open up and talk because she has a language problem. I am also suspect that maybe there is a little less intelligence here than originally thought of. Or maybe there are some motor coordination difficulties, or some other problems. I am somewhat suspect that maybe there are some emotional things going on. I'm not quite sure what it is.

Anita describes an incident where Luz fell in school and never told her family about the accident. Anita attributes that to culture.

> I know that this is also cultural. Kids from these cultures, they are supposed to be wonderful. They aren't supposed to create problems ... what I kind of learn through the years in dealing with them. For them to say to their parents, I need help, I hurt myself. They are afraid that they are going to get in trouble for that because it means that they are going to have to go to the clinic or the hospital or whatever.

Anita's assessment of Luz's academic ability was challenged by the scores of the IOWA Basic Skills test. Apparently, Luz scored in the top third of the class. This was perplexing to Anita.

> Luz scored on the top third of my class. I was somewhat suspect. Then I thought, well maybe this is a child, although she is not good verbally, has through her training developed literacy in our language and does much better silently because, you know, her speaking problems. It was somewhat of a surprise because I thought from what I could see that she had done so far didn't strike me as having wonderful reading skills. But I couldn't prove this, my test results are my proof.

Anita shared her surprise with the ESL teacher. She wanted to "compare this with whatever testing the ESL teachers do." Luz had not scored high enough on the ESL testing to exit out of the program. Anita remains concerned that "a child that can score in the 84th percentile in the reading part of the IOWA test would seem to have enough English language skills to exit the program."

In order to resolve the inconsistency of Luz's classroom and testing performance Anita "has been watching." She admits that what she asks her students to do in the reading groups is different from what they have to on the IOWA test. She contends that the IOWA test is more difficult.

> On the IOWA test they have to read short selections and answer comprehension questions on the material. In reading groups, they have skill pages in the workbook. Very brief sentences that they have to fill in the blanks, cloze types. Sometimes it's picture recognition. Sometimes it's vocabulary words that they experienced in the story. Sometimes it's oral reading. It's really much more basic and much easier (than the IOWA test).

Anita concludes that the only way that Luz could have scored that high on the IOWA test is by cheating.

> What I have learned is that Luz is an excellent, excellent cheat. She can copy answers upside down, backwards, sideways, inside out. She knows how to get answers from somebody else standing on her head ..... I'm sure those answers in the IOWA test were not her own. I'm really positive.

Rosa.

Anita's other language-minority student is Rosa. Rosa is from the Dominican Republic. Anita met Rosa's parents at a parent teacher conference.

> I have been able to talk to her parents through the interpreter teacher that we have. They were kind enough to wait and sit in on a conference. They are both very hardworking people, I think they both have service type jobs. Her mother is a waitress and something else and her father is custodial and something else. Very very hardworking.

Rosa's family, according to Anita, seems closely knit and happy.

> There are a couple of siblings. I think there is a younger and I know there is an older sister in sixth grade, who developed the reputation of being Mother Magdeline in the school. She was the interpreter, the little busybody, but she seems to have that role as well at home. She is number one baby sitter, responsible for certain domestic things around the house because there are younger children and the parents are both at work. I get a sense that as a family group, they are a lot more together. The kids seem to be.... they give the appearance of being happy.

Anita describes Rosa as being "self-confident." In addition, she asserts that Rosa has "some sort of Latin temperament." Anita explains,

> When she gets mad, she gets mad. She'll show it and you know that she is expressive. She doesn't take any nonsense from anyone, if something bothers her. She's a very lovely little girl as far as respect for authority, and that kind of thing. She is very nice.

Academically, Rosa is in the weakest reading group, yet she is the strongest student in that group. "She is rather interesting because she seems to be rather bright, but her reading disability is there because she is an ESL person." According to Anita, although "she doesn't have a good grasp of the language, she has more fluent language." Anita believes that Rosa really belongs "in between her reading group and the next reading group," but scheduling, management and time prevent Anita from creating a new group. She remedies the situation for Rosa by "trying to supplement her somewhat."

Anita believes that Rosa's biggest problem academically is vocabulary and she "feels that there is not enough English spoken in the home situation to

help her improve her vocabulary and really get the language down." Anita wishes that she could do more for Rosa. She maintains, "I don't know where to begin to start to help her." Nevertheless, Anita feels that Rosa will succeed in school.

> Rosa will make it. She's not going to be a brain surgeon, but I think she will get by educationally. She will be able to do whatever it is she attempts.

In addition to family background, Anita believes that there are other factors that differentiate Luz from Rosa, and these factors influence academic success. One factor is native language development.

> For me what I know of ESL students, limited-proficiency students, children learn to speak in one language first. And studies have shown that they need to develop that language first before they ... so these kids are at the greatest risk. I think that part of Luz's problem is that her own language was not developed. She didn't become literate in her own language. I think it is much more effective if they are literate in their own language, or else if we can re-educate that language. OK so maybe she doesn't become literate (in her own language), but she has to at least become fluent. She didn't have that.

Anita cites culture and national origin as another difference between Luz and Rosa which also influences academic success.

> It may also be partly cultural. What I know of the Dominican Republic, you know there is a lot of tourism. Within the past 20 years there has been a lot more American and English speaking people coming to the Island. So possibly they may be more familiar with the language. When I think of El Salvador, I almost get a sense that some of these people were practically bush people. I have had children that have never been to school. Or their first (school) experience in their country was when they were eight.

Finally, Anita believes that Rosa "is academically two years ahead of Luz." However, Anita believes that they both can communicate equally well with their peers. Anita provides an example about Luz.

> Evidently she must be able to communicate with her peers because she seems to be well liked. So in kids' terms she does well enough. She must have social language, because they seem to ... nobody avoids her. Were you here when they clapped for Luz. We did a Latin game and everybody clapped for Luz? It was such a nice thing They really, the kids really like her. They know her parents don't speak English, they know that she came from a different country.

They have been with Luz since kindergarten. They like her.

Social communication, therefore, is not the problem for Luz or Rosa. The problem is when communication is required in academic situations. Anita questions the relationship between communicative ability and academic intelligence. She provides an example of a gifted student in her class.

> Even the better students, like this little boy Richard. He's in academic enrichment, gifted and talented, but he speaks Brooklenese ... or I mean I am not sure when he speaks with his friends it's even worse than when he speaks with me. His grammar, his structure, his choice of vocabulary, his analogy. Whatever it is, if you sat down and talked to him for five minutes you wouldn't necessarily think that he is bright.

Anita clarifies what she means by bright and she continues to question this child's intelligence in spite of his communicative ability and "cultural deprivation."

> He's bright in cognitive ability functioning: he's able to pick up new ideas very quickly. He certainly doesn't speak, and I'm not sure how you would term this, like the super intelligent child that is going to college. He doesn't speak like that. He reads well, he puts himself on paper well. He is very good in math. He's able to pass the IOWA test and that's the bottom line. He is obviously bright. I think that he is culturally deprived. His parents have language or educational ... I don't know what you would call it. There is some lack of discipline at at home. I've heard this from other parents. And maybe there is a lack of discipline in encouraging him to speak properly.

As mentioned previously, Luz and Rosa seem to get along with the other students in Anita's class. Anita believes however, "that the children have the same opinion that their parents have." She feels that the students in her class whose parents are not happy because the ESL students get differential treatment might be insincere in their relationships with Rosa and Luz.

> I think that those parents who don't have an opinion about the kids, then their children are the same way. The ones whose parents object to ESL kids getting different things, I think some of them (their children) overcompensate. Because I think that they might feel guilty about the prejudice type things that they hear at home.

Anita shares an example about one girl in her class this year.

> She is a really nice girl. I happen to know her mother personally. I know that her mother is one of the school board PTA people who had some kind of problem with the fact, that this (the trips) just shouldn't be for ESL. I think that her daughter is really friendly with Luz. She has been all through school with her. I think that she is overcompensating. Because I think that there are times when she would rather be with the other kids.

Anita reflects on some of the staff and programmatic changes that have occurred over the past four years in regards to the education of language-minority students, yet she does not have first hand information behind the causes and reasons of change.

> To my knowledge everything concerned with ESL is not my department. The classroom teacher is not privy to .... This is all very secretive. To my knowledge, from the discussions that I have had with any ESL teachers, we now have our own ESL teacher for the district. When Luz was in kindergarten, we had a teacher for half a day in the whole building with a population of about 20 some odd children.

According to Anita, the principal is behind the current staffing and programmatic choices.

> Since then that has been something (an ESL teacher in every building) the principal has given a push for. The ESL population has pulled our test scores down. They definitely have learning problems so we need more ESL services. We were able to somehow along the line convince the school board to hire their own ESL teacher.

As a result of increased ESL services throughout the district, Anita's school has one ESL teacher who travels between two buildings. In Anita's school, the language-minority children in kindergarten have an extended day. Anita describes the reasons why language-minority students are not pulled out in kindergarten.

> It's a lot of language and it seemed foolish to be pulling these children out of a half day program, taking them away from these language based experiences for ESL. Plus, there was this social stigma that they were being pulled out for ESL. At a very young age the kids were being shown that these kids (language-minority) are really different. Not only do they look different, but they talk different. Usually you don't have any remedial services in kindergarten. So that there is not a pull-out for anything else except for these foreign looking kids that are going off with some other teacher.

Anita maintains that the extended kindergarten day for ESL students is not working as well in practice as it looks on paper.

> So, they (the language-minority kids) stay after dismissal. They play, which I think philosophically speaking sounds good on paper. I'm not sure how it is really working. I think that they would have to do a study. Philosophically speaking, to give them a chance to play, but they are playing with their own because the other kindergarten children aren't there. They aren't playing with their peers, they are playing with other ESL children.

In the other grades, the language-minority children are pulled out of the regular classroom and placed in ESL classes according to chronological age, not language ability.

> (They are placed) just by grade level with no regard for where their ability is. Now if I were tomorrow to have somebody land by helicopter on the school grounds that spoke no English, they would be with Luz and Rosa.

Anita asserts that "a lot of mainstream teachers are up in arms" about the placement policy

> because there have been some border line chronological students. The city school system chronological cutoff is different from ours. What has happened is that some children coming from the city school system, in effect because of their birthday or whatever, could really be in a higher grade than they would be out here. Yet they are more disadvantaged. A lot of mainstream teachers have been like really battling the administration. 'Look put this child back into second grade rather than third grade to give him the benefit of more language experiences, easier classroom material.'

Anita has serious doubts about her school's ESL pull-out program.

> How in god's name are these kids learning how to speak. I think it might be kind of an enhancer, but I don't see it to be a good program when you pull the kids out for 45 minutes everyday. That person (the ESL teacher) in that classroom has the same kind of problems that I am seeing in my classroom. The kids are coming and going all day long. How much can you do? And as I said they are grouped according to their grade, they aren't grouped according to what they know or what they need.

Her doubts however, are not based on first hand experience as she has never observed an ESL class.

> What are they doing in ESL -- they are cooking and sewing...I don't know. I have never been invited to go in there. I have never

> had the opportunity to ... I shouldn't say that I haven't been invited. I have not had the opportunity to go and see what is being done with those children.

Communication between Anita and the ESL teacher is through memos and chance meetings. The ESL teacher has approached Anita through two different memos. The first memo asked for concepts and vocabulary from content areas and the second memo asked for mainstream teachers' input on an ESL report card that the ESL department had developed. In addition, Anita has been approached in person for input.

> I was asked today (by the ESL teacher) if it would be OK for them (the language-minority students) to go on a trip. I don't know, I don't know if it is going to OK. Why should they go on a trip with all the ESL kids. They are going to hate it.

Anita meets with the ESL teacher from time to time, and she doubts how mainstream content can be incorporated into the ESL classroom.

> I mean we do it anyway, we have to meet with the ESL teacher ... It's not a specific time. It's just kind of arbitrary. When the need you know is there. Sometimes it's just, they (the ESL staff) ask us to write down what we did ... but I don't know how the ESL mainstream stuff can be built in the way this program is. Because she gets ESL kids together fourth grade at this time and that is her time to teach ESL to them. And it doesn't matter whether one is non-English speaking and the other is Rosa.

Anita believes that the ideal programmatic approach for language-minority kids is "no approach." According to her philosophy "that is the ideal approach in education." She is not sure how to implement a "no approach" and leaves that responsibility to the experts. She elaborates.

> I think the ideal approach is to treat these kids individually. Not by grade level, not by ESL, not by limited-proficiency or whatever label you want to put on it. But where is this kid at today and what does this child need. How much potential does this child have according to whatever test.

For students who are proficient in a language other than English and enter school in the fourth grade, Anita feels that a bilingual program is most effective.

> If I were tomorrow to get a fully Spanish speaking student, or some other language speaking student, I really think that a bilingual program is more effective. Because a child at the fourth grade level who has been schooled in their native country in their native language is not necessarily stupid. It's not that they don't know content. They don't know our language.

Anita is critical of her school's policy toward ESL students and is suspicious of political commitments.

> One of the ways that the district chooses who becomes part of the ESL program is who has an Hispanic last name. Now that is lunacy. Of course that is the whole political thing. I mean now we made a commitment to ESL. Somebody has obviously made a commitment somewhere down the line. There are contracts and there are legalistic [sic] aspects to this whole thing that has been developed. And you know there are state guidelines and mandates and you are locked into that.

On a more personal level, what challenges Anita most in working with language-minority students in the regular classroom is understanding them and being understood. In addition, she feels inadequate in assessing their needs.

> I don't think that they fully understand me. I don't fully understand them. I'm not sure what their needs are. Because of the language difference, it is even hard to interview them. The test results are not helpful at all, really.

Finally, working with language-minority students who have no experience at all with English is Anita's toughest challenge.

> The most challenging kind of student that I have had has been a student who comes to this country with no English language skills and is plopped in my fourth grade curriculum.

In sum, Anita's two language-minority students have similarities and differences. Both students are native Spanish speakers, but they differ in native language proficiency. Although they are in the same reading group, their academic abilities are different probably because of family life, culture and parental literacy. Anita's school uses a pull-out approach for language-minority students in grades one through six and students are placed in ESL

classes according to grade level. She doubts the pull-out program's effectiveness, although she has never observed an ESL class. In Anita's school there is friction between the teachers, the community and the administration in regard to ESL services. Anita's greatest challenge with language-minority students is assessing needs and teaching students with no background in English. The following section will describe the instructional strategies that Anita employs with her class.

Self-Reported Instructional Practice

Anita's fourth grade classroom is spacious and the walls have an assortment of science and language arts posters. The desks are arranged in four groups of six. Anita has her students arranged in groups because she has "been playing around with cooperative groups." She "assigns kids to science and math activities where there is an equal distribution of heterogeneous small groups." But because of scheduling, Anita finds it difficult to employ cooperative strategies.

> It works beautiful until we run out of ... somebody has to go to music class. I just don't have them all day. I just don't have the where-with-all to manage the time. There are some days where it just gets to you. You can't anticipate.

Because of her class schedule, Anita finds that she has her students doing a lot of independent work. Having language-minority students in her class does not affect her selection of material. In fact, Anita does not have control over content. "Content-wise, I don't decide, I'm using pre-packaged programs." Anita does feel however, that having language-minority students in her class does "affect my approaches and the kinds of things that I do." She compares the strategies employed in her lowest reading group when she did not have language-minority students to the strategies that she uses now.

> If I didn't have any language-minority like last year, I may not do

> as much modeling. I may not do as many things. I had a bottom reading group. We did more vocabulary work and more in-depth kind of comprehension work. With the ESL element I do more cultural things. I pull from their experiences. I try to get them to do more speaking. You must be able to speak and children learn how to talk before they can read. I try to enhance that.

Anita feels most confident in teaching reading and she has three reading groups in her class.

> Of course reading is my thing. I would teach reading all day. I really like it and I think it shows that I was trained. I guess I feel confident that I have gotten my masters in it.

Both Luz and Rosa are in the lowest reading group. There are two other students in the group. One student, according to Anita, should be in a self-contained special education class and the other student has a behavioral problem. Anita feels that the book she is using is too difficult for Luz, but she doesn't have the energy to create another group.

> The vocabulary is a little difficult for her. Basically I cannot, I don't have the where-with-all to create another group. I really should have one more group.

Anita feels that Luz should be reading in a book that is her level. The book they are using is already one grade below but Anita won't put her in a second grade reader because of her brother and culture.

> She is going to know that it is a second grade reader because she has a brother in first grade. Also she is a lot more mature. I also happen to know that that is difficult in that particular culture. They happen to mature physically at an earlier age. Culturally, there are 13 and 14 year old mothers. It's just a fact of life.

Unlike Luz, Rosa presents the opposite problem for Anita in the lowest reading group. Anita contends that Rosa is the strongest in the bottom reading group. She does not feel that Rosa would benefit from being placed in a higher group.

> The vocabulary, the series, the whole thing is definitely not ... As a matter of fact the book that we are in (the lowest book) is probably better for her than the rest of them.

Dissatisfied with the levels of her lowest reading group, Anita nevertheless moves along. She has her students doing fill in the blank vocabulary exercises and reading aloud. Rosa does well in these activities but Luz often does not. "Her (Luz) copying is not good. The words were there but she doesn't copy them correctly." Anita uses behavioral modification techniques by giving money to her students and she explains how this came about.

> It came about because I had really been overworked and I hadn't gotten to the store. I usually give them little treats. I have these coins in my desk, people borrow money or I have to make change. One day I got the idea to give out dimes and they really liked it. In actuality I don't know how much Luz or Rosa ever get. Not that they are not taken care of. But how often does somebody come over. My kids get a kick out of their father giving them a quarter. So it's a big thrill to these kids.

Anita is not really sure whether the instructional strategies she employs work for Luz and Rosa. She knows that what she is doing in spelling is not working for Luz.

> Sometimes I'm not sure, It's really hard. The only way that I know is if when we do it again, they remember. I know what I am doing with Luz in spelling is not working. I sort of don't expect it to. Spelling is not one of my priorities. I understand that but I also don't think that I can lower my standards.

One strategy that Anita employs that does work is "the word bank." The word bank provides students with a variety of vocabulary words that are spelled correctly on the blackboard. Anita uses this strategy for all kids and she explains why.

> A lot of kids will hesitate to even take the risk to put the word down if they can't spell it right. That's a frightening word to spell on their own especially if they are in my weak reading group. So I use a word bank on the blackboard and this word bank is going to be used for question one and this word bank is going to be used for question two. And I do that not only for my ESL kids, but for the weaker readers. Something that they desperately need.

Pre-writing is another strategy that Anita uses with her class. Anita provides the class with a series of questions that if answered could be

organized into a paragraph. Luz is on her third draft of a paragraph that she is writing about her favorite sport.

> The idea of this activity is that the questions were supposed to help us, like a pre-writing activity. My direction was that we were going to take the answers to the questions and make them into sentences to make paragraphs. That's a big job for Luz. She is off to a nice start and the next thing that I have to do is sit down and conference with her and get her to talk to me. Maybe I will be her secretary and write.

Anita is not always sure that Luz and Rosa understand parts of a lesson. In order to check comprehension Anita calls on Luz and Rosa.

> I usually call on them. I'm one of those teachers who I'm always calling on Luz and Rosa. I give other people a chance too. That's my only way. I have to check their comprehension by calling on them.

In addition, she monitors how much they contribute. Anita has her doubts about her language-minority students' participation in a discussion and their ability to to "produce an answer on a pre-packaged test."

> If they are able to contribute ... If they are able to then ... unfortunately I know that sometimes they are understanding it in a discussion, but I don't know how long they are able to keep it. Then when it comes to producing the answer for a test, they get bogged down with the reading of the question and the comprehension of the question. And some of the prepackaged tests for example the science, Luz might have a general idea, but she doesn't have the ability to read through the test and then come up with the right answer.

When it comes to comprehension, Anita believes that Rosa has difficulty "understanding when the sentence structure is more unusual than average." Anita believes that vocabulary is an obstacle to comprehension.

> Vocabulary is a big problem because if it is a word that she is not familiar with. It's really hard because she, her native language is being spoken at home. So she has the disadvantage that a fourth grade child who has English speaking parents [sic]. I make a comparison of the tennis player, you should always play with a person who plays better than you. And they are speaking at home, a lot of the ESL children, to parents who speak worse than them.

When Luz or Rosa do not understand something in class, Anita restates or encourages them to say it the best way that they can.

> I try to rephrase it. Or you are almost there, teli me a little more. If we are talking about, well math, if we are talking about how you find an answer. And then they say, 'well you do this.' I say what do you mean this, give me a word that tells what this number is. If I feel that they know. I only push them when I know that we have reviewed something that they should know.

Anita believes that math is the easiest subject to teach ESL students because if "is an international language, it's concrete." On the other hand, "writing, grammar, grammatical rules and vocabulary are the most difficult."

In summary, Anita would like to do a lot more cooperative activities in her class but she feels restricted by her students' schedules. She uses pre-packaged curricular materials that might not necessarily be effective with her language-minority students. She checks comprehension by calling on her language-minority students and she monitors their participation in classroom discussions. She believes that math is much easier to teach language-minority students. She questions her effectiveness with all her students, although her students seem to enjoy themselves.

> I'm not sure whether they really like the work or if they have accepted the way that I do things, or if they are willing to go along because I give them a few bennies [sic] now and then. They seem to be pretty agreeable. I'm not sure whether it's a product of my structuring or if that's just the way they are. It's hard to judge that about your own class. It really is because you don't know what they are really like. And I don't know if that is an indication of what kind of job I'm doing.

Professional Development and Support

With the exception of staff development workshops, Anita does not feel a strong sense of support from the school administration in her work with language-minority students. She believes that the administration needs to be more aware of what is going on in the classroom and less driven by politics.

> It's politics. The community likes the music program and we have this district concert where everybody from all over the place comes and sees. It looks very nice on paper. But these people out there don't realize that in order to get that one concert accomplished these kids are pulled out of my class twice a month to go to a district rehearsal for an entire morning.

Anita believes that awareness should be initiated from the top and she would benefit from direct contact with an administrator.

> What I think is needed is more monitoring of what is happening in the schools and the classrooms. I would have no qualms, I'm probably speaking out of turn and maybe my union leader would put my head on the chopping block because it is anti-contract. But I myself would not have any qualms with somebody, an administrator or whoever, coordinating and coming in and observing my ESL students, and see how they are functioning and performing.

Support, for Anita, could come in the form of communication which must be built into the teacher's job responsibilities. Communication, according to Anita "is a problem in the whole school." Without enough time to meet with other staff members, Anita feels unprofessional.

> .... an ESL coordinator that comes around and meets with the classroom teacher. Basically I find myself having to run and talk to people all the time. I'm getting tired, I don't feel very professional having to do this..... we have to sit down and we have to talk. But it has to be enforced from somewhere up here. It doesn't come unless the intentions are really good. I'm sure the ESL teacher would really love to sit down with me once a week and discuss my students, but we don't have the time. But if it were imposed on us ....

Anita's school is obligated by contract to have monthly staff meetings, but so far this year they have only had one. Anita believes talking face to face would be more efficient than the passing of memos.

> I think so much more could be accomplished. The most expedient way is to do it on paper. Put a note in somebody's box. Then they don't tell you what they are hearing. Then these children are telling that we are doing some other curriculum and it isn't true.

The support that Anita's school provides in working with language-minority students is through staff development workshops. Last year, Anita's district provided 12 ESL workshops in a row. Anita expresses her feelings about these workshops.

> I found that most of these workshops dealt more with a philosophy. I don't think that they really... they didn't help me in my particular classroom. Most of the workshops that I experienced, they give you a sampling of what you could do. Oh thank you very much I have 23 other students. With one ESL student I should go home and cut and paste all my phonics books and resource materials. How much time am I allowing for this?

Time to prepare materials is a major reason that the ESL workshops are not valuable for Anita.

> It wasn't helpful to me because of time. Give me stuff. Give me a goody bag. You can use this with your fourth grade students who don't speak English. I will use it.

Anita suggests a variety of specific materials that would support her efforts in working with language-minority students in the regular classroom. Her first suggestion is an adapted Basal reader.

> Maybe somebody familiar with ESL should write a good Basal series that will deal with this cross-cultural, without making the vocabulary so difficult that even the classroom teacher doesn't know how to pronounce the kids' names in the story. Some of the names are so difficult that it even intimidates the teachers. So you can imagine how a 10 year old feels.

Secondly, she suggests worksheets, designed by an ESL specialist, that deal with specific vocabulary confusion.

> The thing with Luz, she had the confusion with those vocabulary terms. I think that three or four worksheets that were designed by an ESL person who knows the approach to the stages of language development (would be good). I was not aware that in Spanish milos [sic] is thousand. Now I can see where that would cause confusion.

Finally, Anita would benefit from knowing what publishing companies have materials for language-minority students. "Give me a place to go, this is a company that makes the kind of materials that you are looking for."

In addition to resources, Anita believes that an aide would provide the real support that she needs. She mentions that the "ESL teacher has an aide."

> An extra pair of hands ... I think that is probably the most invaluable thing that any classroom teacher who wants to do any kind of individualized teaching could have. That's why I signed up to have

> student teachers because they can be utilized in that way. If they are good.

Finally, an idea of Anita's that would support her efforts in working with language-minority students is to handle these students as they are handled in special education. Anita believes that IEP's (Individual Education Profiles) would benefit language-minority students and create a mechanism of communication between her and the ESL staff.

> If anybody asked me my opinion on what to do with ESL children that's what I would tell them to do. That they should have their own IEP's. They should be handled like special education students.

Specifically, Anita believes that

> they should be evaluated by a battery of tests, with a variety of specialists, an intelligence quotient, in whatever language is appropriate. Because that becomes a problem. Child A might have to take their test in the native language. Child B may not have enough language to take an IQ test. So I think that should be determined for each individual student.

Anita asserts that an IEP would eliminate the problem of lumping these kids in an ESL class as if they all have the same needs.

> Right now we have this set of rules for all ESL students as if they are exactly the same .... And I think even the ESL pull-out teachers are having difficulty in trying to handle this because they are trying to do similar things. They're re trying to enhance the curriculum that is being taught in the classroom. But they are also floundering. Because they, I think, that they should have someone over there giving them an IEP. There are too many pieces missing. The time spent in those classes is almost wasted.

Anita believes that the classroom teacher should be responsible for the education of her students.

> I think that the only way that we can feasibly do this is with the classroom teacher. I think they need to be in a regular classroom, but like a special education pull-out child, that I would have in my class. Every year they are re-evaluated with a variety of tests. Then the IEP's are written up so that I as a classroom teacher can see what things they need and can see their test results and to see where they have improved and where they have fallen down. And I think that we need to have like we do for special education. We have a student service team that meets. Well, maybe there could be an ESL team that meets with the classroom teacher for additional support.

She does feel however, that the ESL teacher should be the one responsible for writing the IEP.

> I mean the ESL teacher probably has the expertise to write up the child's IEP. That I think would be more the ESL teacher's domain. Especially if you talk about non-English speaking students as opposed to limited-English speaking.

According to Anita, her confidence in working with language-minority students depends on the individual child.

> I feel less capable when the child has less language. The more deficit the child is in the language the more incapable I feel. Because being a fourth grade teacher, not being there at the initial stages. When I was a kindergarten teacher I wasn't intimidated because I really felt that they (the language-minority students) were probably learning just as much as the rest of them.

Anita believes that she has some of the essential skills and knowledge necessary to work with language-minority students.

> For myself personally, I think I have enough experience as a classroom teacher that I know already. I build up their culture, boost their self-esteem. I think that all the things that apply to any good teacher apply to ESL.

She does believe that she needs to learn more language-specific activities.

> Where I think I fall apart is that I am not familiar with the kinds of things that I can do to help them speak more language. Especially when they don't have exposure to my language at home.

Anita would like to help her students understand the language-minority students better. Anita comments about the effects of segregation.

> Maybe a few things as to how I can get the other children to be more accepting or more involved. In this particular kind of community, in a suburban community, where a lot of ... These kids go off to one area where there may be four or five ESL families living in an area, as opposed to the majority of the class is in a self-contained family unit type dwelling. They (the ESL kids) seem to, just, what would you call it, just by their environment be separated. Just a natural separation.

In addition, she would like to know how to get the language-minority families more involved. She acknowledges the fact that families play an important role in their children's participation in school activities.

> Or just ways that these kids can get more involved in after school programs without it being such a drain on their families. It's just not here in a suburban school. Most of the afternoon activities your mother has to pick you up or drop you off. Or pay for it, especially now that we are on an austerity budget. I think that some kind of after school, something that gets the kids involved, other than lunch time.

Anita wants to know how to "cross that bridge" of understanding for kids.

> So how to like cross that bridge for kids. Get them to be accepted by their peers, even though they may not attend the birthday parties, or be on the baseball of softball teams.

Anita has had the opportunity to participate in a prejudice awareness curriculum but she is skeptical.

> We have been given the opportunity to participate in a prejudice awareness program. I am only hesitant because it is a bunch of curriculum. It's another curriculum for me to teach. I don't know if that is really what I want. They say that it can be incorporated into the 15 other curriculums [sic] that I already don't have enough time to teach.

In conclusion, Anita does not feel a tremendous amount of support from her school administration. She has been provided with staff development opportunities, but they are ineffective. She would directly benefit by having adapted Basal readers, supplementary worksheets and a list of publishers who supply ESL materials. In addition, IEP's for each language-minority student would support her in the regular classroom and create a communication mechanism for her and the ESL teacher. Anita believes that her classroom experience contributes to some degree of success with language-minority students; however, she would like to be as effective with her language-minority students as she is with the rest of the class.

Joshua

Born and raised in Brooklyn and educated in the New York City public schools, Joshua's friends and family were quite surprised when he began

teaching six years ago. "You're a teacher now?" they say. "Do you remember what you were like in high school?" As a student, Joshua met with limited succcess, although intelligence and passing grades were not the problem.

> I was a classic behavior problem in school. I was an intelligent class clown, the attention getter. I always had the brains but I was a real pain in the ass for my teachers. I was inquisitive. I was sneaky. I copied homework. I cut class.

As a result of Joshua's behavior he was expelled from the honors' classes in junior high school, even though he had maintained the necessary 85 average. He was reassigned to classes with the other students who also "dropped out" or were "dropped from" the honors program. These other students were not as academically able as Joshua but they were versed in drinking, drugs and having fun.

Looking back on his high school days, Joshua admits that he was "emotionally" confused. His father, an attorney, and his mother, an employee for the city board of education, were talking about divorce and Joshua "took his aggressions out in school." Despite problems at home and school, he managed to graduate from high school with an 85 average.

Like many middle class high school graduates, Joshua went on to college at a state university. With vague career goals of being a therapist, he enrolled in psychology and history courses at Stony Brook. The psychology courses lacked "relevance" so he neglected to attend. "I had a great time (in college), but didn't go to school." His father, however, intervened declaring that "he wasn't going to pay for school if Joshua was going to get bad grades."

Joshua subsequently transfered to Queens College and enrolled in a history course. His love of history was passed down from his father who had also been a history major. In addition to the history course, Joshua enrolled in an education course by default. "It was the only class that was open and fit into my schedule." His professors that semester were the sparks that ignited

Joshua's interest in education. Joshua describes his first education professor as "phenomenal, godlike and inspirational." His history teacher at that time received even more praise. He was

> the man that I most wanted to be like. He was extraordinarily intelligent, worldly and never placed himself above the students. He never made you (the student) feel stupid. Even if you didn't know what you were doing you just didn't feel dumb when you gave the wrong answer.... (If people didn't do the reading) he wouldn't embarrass them and make them feel bad. He would say alright so you don't have the answer this time, I expect next week you'll be very fluent on pages 45 to 48.

Reflecting back on his high school experiences, Joshua compares his college professor's response to student unpreparedness to that of his high school teachers. "Most of my teachers would have said, 'you stupid son of a bitch, you'll never get anywhere in life.'"

Suddenly, because of his interest in history, his outstanding teachers and his work with teenagers in community organizations, Joshua began to think about teaching. One of his advisors pointed him in the direction of global studies. "So it began," says Joshua, "my career in teaching."

Joshua graduated from Queens College with a major in political science, a minor in education, and a state teaching license in history. Responding to looks of surprise when friends discover that he is a high school teacher who works best with kids who are unmotivated, Joshua uses his own experiences as a student to inform his teaching.

> I know exactly what the kids are doing. I don't have any preconceived notions of what the kids should be. I know what they are because I was one.

In summary, although not the best of students himself, Joshua went to college. He went because of potential academic abilities, family pressure and economic means; he had no intention of pursuing a teaching career. As far as becoming a teacher, it was primarily people, outstanding teachers, that influenced Joshua. "I had one outstanding elementary school teacher, a

couple in junior high and high school and some great professors. I learned that teachers could be people, too."

Current Teaching Context

Joshua has been teaching history and global studies, grades 9 to 12, at an urban high school for the past four years. This urban high school, which boasts "being the most ethnically diverse high school in the city," has a student population of 3500 who speak over 53 different languages. As Joshua describes it, "it's an off the boat school ... this area seems to be a magnet for middle class working people from Latin America, Asia, the Middle East and Eastern Europe." In addition to the large immigrant population, there are a number of students from the housing projects which are located a block from the school. The student population ranges from lower to middle class.

As diverse as the student population is, the teaching staff is the opposite. According to Joshua, the teaching staff is "predominantly white and Jewish." There is some mix in terms of Latino and Asian staff in the bilingual department, and the ESL department has Korean and Chinese staff members. The social studies department, to which Joshua belongs, is comprised of 30 teachers, and is "predominantly white, male, Jewish and over the age of 45." Joshua is one of the "handful of teachers" under 30 in the department. Joshua describes the intellectual capabilities of his colleagues as average, but is not complimentary about their personalities. "They (colleagues) are pretty normal ... your basic assortment of angry, stupid, obnoxious, self-centered, paranoid people." He is perplexed why some of his colleagues have gone into the profession. "I'm frustrated that the teachers are not more interested in teaching ... I don't know what they are really in it for." For Joshua, teaching is more than just giving classes. Since becoming a teacher, he has gone on most

of the senior trips. "It's not just the classroom stuff ... it's going on trips, baseball games and shows ... being part of the school ... showing them that you are people." He feels that teachers who pursued teaching to get something "are in the wrong profession." What concerns Joshua about some of his colleagues is

> that a lot of the people (teachers) who are supposed to be helping students are tremendously needy and they have very low self esteem which is not fostered by this particular work atmosphere. You get people with very little self esteem and low respect in the job and you can see the kinds of situation it sets up.

The atmosphere of the school is "often terrible" and this is due in part to the principal. Joshua gives the principal mixed reviews as she, on one hand, "keeps the school together," but, on the other hand, "inspires fear when she deals with people." This mixed review stems from the principal's personality, responsibilities and the school itself.

> Because of the ethnic diversity of the students and also the location of the school (near the housing projects) there are [sic] a tremendous number of gangs and gang fights in the projects which occasionally come into the school. It is a potentially explosive situation. She (the principal) as a person does a very good job of keeping what is outside, outside. But with that comes her way of dealing with people.

Joshua is ambivalent as far as receiving support from the principal. He is basically left alone to do what he wants"... as long as I don't cross her ... if I did anything that displeased her I would be gone as quickly as anybody else." In the social studies department alone during the past three years there have been over 20 staff changes, mostly transfers and firings.

A typical school day for Joshua's begins at 6:45 a.m. when he arrives at school. His 10th grade homeroom, which is mostly Asian students, is his first formal task. Joshua is not sure that his students understand the announcements or the handouts. They (the students) are basically quiet. It's only 12 minutes a day, so that's not the biggest deal in the world." After

homeroom he goes to first period where he is responsible for sitting at the main lobby of the school where he stamps student late passes. Fifteen minutes before his first class, which is second period, Joshua goes upstairs and gathers his materials. Joshua teaches 10th grade European Studies 1, from Greece and Rome to the Industrial Revolution, to four different classes a day. He also teaches a period of global studies. Joshua considers himself lucky because he is in the same classroom for four periods a day. He goes to another room for his last period.

> I mean you're lucky if you can be in the same room five periods a day. It's not likely. And there is always someone using your room when you are not there.

In the European Studies class, Joshua does the exact same lesson, regardless of the students in his class. He has been told that "if students have been placed in (your) class, assume that they understand what you are doing." Not only is the content of Joshua's classes the same, but the structure is also. A few minutes before each class he hangs the maps and writes the homework assignment on the board. As the students arrive, he collects the homework and settles the students down to begin class. During a 40 minute period, Joshua gets

> 35 minutes to teach. That includes distributing homework, collecting homework, taking attendance ... the bell rings, the kids come in, they sit down. The time has already started so as soon as they come in, all right, copy the homework, get it done, quick, quick, let's go, let's go. Pass up the homework, pass those back to everybody else, any questions from last night's homework.

Joshua tries to get into the motivation for the lesson as quickly as possible. He describes his teaching strategy as "developmental," which is the only way "given the time constraints and curricular constraints from the board of education." Developmental lessons are

> ones that have a clear goal in mind ... you (the teacher) elicit information through a series of questions in order to get to that goal at the end. And you move methodically through history from one point to another so that the kids get some sort of time line consistency.

Joshua views the "in class" aspect of his job as challenging and keeping himself motivated all day everyday is his biggest personal challenge. "If I'm not on my toes the whole day, if I don't have enthusiasm for what I am doing the kids will pick it up in half a second and the class dies." He believes that consistency in teaching style and lesson format are important because

> at least from what I know of most of the students and from what I knew about my life in high school, there is a lot of turbulence...whether it's parents, friends or teachers. Just going from one class to another, running through the hallways, trying to get to class, saying 'hi' to your friends and then sitting down in the classroom and having the teacher be disjointed....that's too much for kids.

In addition to keeping himself motivated and consistent, "getting the kids to believe in themselves" and fostering realistic expectations is another of Joshua's daily challenges.

> I think that the thing for me is to try and get these kids to believe that they are intelligent, that they can do it. I mean you (the students) may not be doing it now, but that doesn't mean that you can't be better tomorrow. You're not going to jump from a 20 on your first test to a 90. But you can jump from a 20 to a 50, then from a 50 to a 65, from a 65 to a 70. Maybe by the end of the year you'll be in the 70's which isn't too bad when you started in the 20's.....I'll get my test grades back and 65 to 70% of the kids failed. That's fine with me because it's the first test of the marking period.

Joshua teaches 160 students a day and with that large a number it's difficult to know all the students.

> Unfortunately most of the students that stand out do so for three reasons. Either they are extraordinarily articulate in class, they are extremely personable or they are a pain in the ass.

He enjoys teaching kids that are "open to possibilities, kids that are not intimidated by the system and that don't conform.....I like to teach the kids that are willing to try stuff."

Joshua usually prepares his lessons the night before class. He uses the curriculum guide but complains that the curriculum "does not take into account the variety and level of students that you (the teacher) has." The

standardized exams that the students must take at the end of the year definitely restrict his planning.

> This restriction is a common complaint that the standardized tests at the end of the year force you (the teacher) to teach to a particular goal. I have no choice. If I teach all the way that I want to teach my kids are going to fail the standardized tests at the end of the year. And then if they fail my chairman is going to ask me why. I could answer, well they really learned how to read ... They (the administration) tell you that on one hand they don't care about what style you teach. There is no standardized lesson plan. On the other hand if they don't learn this and this by this point then you are dead.

Joshua tries to figure out what in the lesson might be interesting to his students."... to get the students to internalize the information as something that means something to them ... how to do that and still efficiently discuss the series of dates and names ..." is challenging. He tries to get his students to understand concepts. "If you can understand big ideas, anybody can understand big ideas, the facts will follow, that's what they have books for."

In summary, aspects of teaching in an ethnically diverse urban high school are both frustrating and challenging. The frustrations stem mainly from outside of the classroom responsibilities and include lack of support and praise. The challenges for Joshua are remaining motivated, instilling confidence in his students and balancing meaningful lessons with standardized test pressures.

Language-Minority Students

With 160 students per day, Joshua estimates that 40 to 50% of his students are language-minority. The majority of students are Latinos and Asians. "There are large groups of students from Korea, China, the Dominican Republic, Argentina and Colombia." Language skills and culture make it difficult for Joshua to get to know many of his language-minority students. He describes his homeroom experience.

> I had some kids in my homeroom last year that were really language-minority kids. English wasn't their first language by a long shot. They were still in dictionaries. I did get to know some of them but it's difficult because they are not open to communicating. Their English skills are not that good; they feel rather intimidated to speak another language. And they don't want to speak to someone, especially a teacher. These kids come from a society where teachers are revered, respected and feared, so speaking in a casual sort of manner about what goes on at home or outside of school isn't something that (they are used to).

Joshua describes the programs and alternatives that are available to language-minority students in his school. Language-minority students, upon arrival, are immediately placed in ESL classes. According to Joshua, the ESL program in the school is content-based.

> (In ESL) they have different (ESL) teachers for each subject.....they (the students) aren't in there all day. They are in there for 40 minutes. They follow the same type of schedule as every other student in the school. They'll have 40 minutes of ESL science, 40 minutes of ESL history, and 40 minutes of ESL English.

Joshua has no contact with the ESL history teacher. He describes, however, a recent shift in state law. "ESL history classes have to be taught by history and not ESL teachers." This law will be implemented in the next school year. Some training will be provided in ESL methods but the rationale behind the law is

> ESL teachers who have no history background, should not be teaching history to anybody much less the ESL students. And that since the students are learning basic English it should not be something that we (the history teachers) could do.

Joshua, through comments about the impact of this law, describes his impressions towards content-based ESL.

> ...the ESL department has really taken it upon themselves to teach a variety of subjects to which they have no real content area experience. So there are people who are teaching history who have never taken history in college.

In addition to the content area ESL program, there are a variety of bilingual programs, but because of staffing "we don't have bilingual programs for all languages...the only bilingual history class is in Spanish." Joshua

reflects on his experience of the effectiveness of some of the bilingual Spanish history classes. "....when I first came to this school, they threw me into a bilingual history class and I don't speak Spanish." Joshua was given the position of bilingual Spanish teacher because

> they didn't have a bilingual teacher and they basically told me to take it. If you don't take it somebody else will take it and they won't speak Spanish either.

Eventually a lawyer from Puerto Rico was hired as the bilingual Spanish teacher. This person however is not bilingual (he doesn't speak English) and has no teaching degree. The goal, according to Joshua, of the bilingual program is to find the best person to teach this particular bilingual history class. "...If the idea is to get them (the students) to speak English, then it's me. If the idea is to get them to learn history, it's him."

Clarity of program goals is one difference between the ESL and bilingual programs in Joshua's school.

> I think that what they are trying to do (in ESL) is to get the kids to learn English then throw them into regular classes. They are only mandated to stay in ESL for six months.

Joshua feels that the school's goals are driven by graduation requirements and demands of the larger society.

> Unfortunately it's to get them to graduate.... that if a kid can't speak English where are they going to go?...I don't care if it takes them until they are 20 to learn English and get out of high school, they have to do it!

Another difference between the ESL and bilingual program is testing. ESL students are given a test in order to enter mainstream classes. Joshua comments on the ESL program and the testing which is supposed to identify the students that are ready for the mainstream.

> ...they don't have enough English though. They may understand me, but they can't write and they can't read. So I have kids who are taking a (history) test with a dictionary looking up every word.

Joshua doubts the level of listening comprehension when language-minority students are mainstreamed and comments on his role.

> There is no way for me to do anything about it. I can't meet with them individually. I can offer to do that and I have, but these kids will not come forward and say 'we don't understand English we need help.' They are looking at it like we were in ESL and now you are going to move me back. 'We don't want to go back to ESL.' So there is no way for me to get through to them.

Academic success which includes learning English is dependent on the student. "The kids that have a sense of what they want or even just a sense of responsibility or determination will learn the language and get better at it." He uses the example of Ramona to stress his point.

> I had one student Ramona from Argentina. I had her in my bilingual class when she arrived. She didn't speak English, right off the boat. She tried desperately, she worked at it (English) with the dictionary. Then I had her the next term in my regular mainstream global studies. She participated in class every day. She loved to talk and when she mastered English she talked all the time. Her reading and writing skills were not that good, her test grades were 80's. She is smarter than that though. It's that she just hadn't mastered the English in terms of writing skills. Well this same girl just won the city history contest. She's going to meet the mayor and she wrote the essay in English.

With almost half of the students in Joshua's classes language-minority, Joshua comments on the role of the teacher in setting the pace and accepting these students.

> It takes patience because they can't get the words together. Some of them really struggle. I had two girls (Korean and Chinese)....they want to participate, they know the answers. They fight with it (English). But as long as you stay with them they will get it out....I'm willing to take the couple of minutes that it takes, it's worth it to me to find out what this kid said and to reinforce the good thing that they said and move on from there.

The other students in the class are generally accepting. For one thing they are used to being around language-minority students. They do receive cues from the teacher and in Joshua's class they are generally helpful.

> Sometimes when I can't figure out what a kid is saying, I don't want to put words in their mouth. Sometimes they will say the word four or five

> times and I can't understand what they mean. The other kids will get frustrated, but then they will help.

Joshua has fairly consistent attendance in his classes. This is due to the fact that he will "drive them out if they're not going to do the work." The first time that they return to class after a long absence (two or three weeks) Joshua will

> hit them with 14 homework assignments...They either realize they are going to do the work or they aren't going to show. I don't want them in here if they aren't going to do the work.

Joshua considers himself quite strict and his rationale is "it's like everybody has a right to education, and you don't have a right to disturb anybody else in class." His passing percentages are not that high which is not surprising or disturbing.

> It's not that unusual, especially because I was teaching four repeater classes. Classes that are off track.... these are either for kids who failed it when they took it the first time, or this is the first time they are taking it because they came to the school in December.... Combine that with the fact that a lot of my kids don't speak English, I won't pass them.

Joshua shares an example of a language-minority student who did not pass his course.

> He had a 57 average on his tests and he did 21 out of 50 homework assignments. He participated in class, but not everyday. He failed because of his homework assignments. Had he done all of his homework assignments he would have passed.

Joshua asserts that all his students know about course requirements from the beginning.

> Yes he knew all the way through. Late homework is worth half credit. And there will be somewhere between 50 and 60 homework assignments. And if you really want to help your grade you will do somewhere near all the homework assignments.

For Joshua the most challenging aspect of working with language-minority students in the mainstream classroom is "helping them to get it." He cites examples of some of his language-minority students.

> I had a kid. We just got back their second tests. And to see the improvement. To give you an idea of how these kids (language-minority) do ... one kid got a 20 on the first test and a 43 on the second. Wan Fu (maybe a Korean), got a 58 on the first test and an 82 on the second. Mike Shu, Chinese, I believe got a 48 on the first test and a 78 on the second.

Joshua gives two tests every marking period and he usually counts the first grade. However, it is strictly up to him.

> Literally you can do what you want, I can count them (test scores) as a strict average across the board. If they get a 20 on the first test you can average it or I can forget about it. If they get a 20 on the first test and a 60 on the second test, and all the other grades are above, I may just not even count it.

Multiple factors could cause a student to do poorly on the first test and these factors are the rationale that Joshua uses when he decides whether to average in the first test score or not.

> Basically, what I'm thinking is that the kid either messed up, was not trying very hard, didn't know the stuff, or it was a mistake or a fluke. I don't want to completely penalize the kid for messing up on the first test. Just the first test of the semester, you don't know the teacher, you don't know the kind of test they are going to give.

Joshua recounts what happened and provides a rationale for Di Ping who got a 36 on the first test and a 94 on the second.

> Her face lit up. She was, I mean they are taught to be so humble and quiet. ... Maybe she changed the way that she studied for the second test, practicing her writing, because that to me is the key. If you can write you will do OK. That's what I keep telling them.

Communicating to the teacher that the material is understood is fundamental for language-minority students. Joshua relates an incident where a Korean student approached him after the test to contest her grade.

> She asked me why she only got 6 out of 10 on the essay and ... she was right, I mean all the information was there. She really deserved 9 out of 10, 10 out of 10. But it was so poorly written, the facts were all there but it was a puzzle and you really had to find the sentences. After I read it again, I really saw that she did know what she was talking about.

Realizing that the student deserved a higher grade, Joshua changed her score. He acknowledged his oversight. "The problem is that night I had to read 150

essays....the fact that it wasn't clear, it just went right by me." What concerns Joshua is that this student was the first all semester to approach him with a question. "So I gave almost 400 exams and one kid came to see me with questions."

In order to reinforce the Korean student's behavior, Joshua took the student's test home, rewrote it and gave it back to her.

> I took it (the essay) home with me and rewrote it using the exact same words that she used just changing them around. Writing simple sentences. I didn't add any facts to it, I didn't do anything. I told her this is what she wanted to include. This would be the proper way to write it. Look at what you wrote and look how I changed it. See the difference.

Joshua has seen some "extraordinary" improvement during the course of the school year, especially in his sixth period class. And although he acknowledges the teacher's role, it is the students that deserve the credit. "The dramatic changes over the course of the semester with these kids ..... the work ethic is there." He feels good about this mostly Asian class because the "biggest thing that can happen to these kids is that they get lost." He is concerned about other teachers. "When teachers see that they don't speak English they just forget about them." Joshua attributes most of the success of this class to the kids themselves, but he credits himself as well.

> For me it's just a matter of keeping after them the same way that I keep after all other students, making sure they do their homework, making sure they don't copy.

In addition to keeping after his students, Joshua takes time for student conferences during the semester.

> What I did was I sat down with them about half way through the second marking period. I take two days where I give them reading assignments and questions and I speak to each kid individually and I tell them how they are doing and what they could do better. That way I get to meet each and every one of them which I don't get to do all the time.

Joshua has been criticized by other teachers for wasting time in class with student conferences; however, he thinks the practice is necessary.

> I don't feel it is a waste at all. I never get to sit down and talk to them unless they come to me and I've only had three or four students that came to me over the whole year that asked for help.

Joshua regards language-minority student improvement as admirable, especially when one considers the nature of the English language.

> I think that certainly English as a language to learn is ridiculous. I look at Chinese and I think that would be a really difficult language to learn, but from what I understand it is pretty straight-forward. Yes, there are a lot of symbols, and it's tough to learn just by memorizing different characters, but English is horribly tricky.

Patience, for Joshua, is the key, to working with language-minority students. "Explaining to them the differences between 'through,' 'threw,' 'dessert,' 'desert' and 'desert'." In addition, some students have a tremendous desire to learn even with language and cultural obstacles.

> I see it in their desire to learn, their refusal to give up, that not only do these kids have problems with the language, but with the social structure of the United States, that is vastly different from where they come from. So they are not, especially the women used to being assertive, not used to speaking out at all, saying what is on their mind.

Joshua provides a rationale for the above analysis with an example.

> I had this one girl, even with her language problems she was getting 80's and 90's on the tests. She started in the 30's. And when I called on her in class, she never raised her hand. But if I called on her she would give me an answer and it was always on target, completely correct, but so soft ... but she would do it and she knew she had the right answer, and she was proud of it because you could see it on her face.

Another incident with a Haitian student, which could be attributed to cultural obstacles, occurred when a college student was doing classroom observations in Joshua's class.

> This kid from Haiti kind of whispered the answer (to a question) to himself or didn't raise his hand. At the end of the class she (the college student) came up to me and said that he is really smart, he knew all the answers to all the questions. I said, 'yes but he never raises his hand.' He will respond if I call on him but he won't raise his hand. He is either completely embarrassed or unsure of himself or it could be anything. But, this is very common. They are just not like part of the (mainstream).

As mentioned previously, through the example of Ramona from Argentina, Joshua feels that individual student determination is essential for academic success. But even with determination, students and teachers need to hold realistic expectations for language-minority students. "(The language-minority student) has to know that it's OK not to know the language, especially if he just arrived, don't worry about it, just do it."

In conclusion, Joshua admits that it's difficult to get to know all his language-minority students because he has approximately 160 of them. In addition, language-minority students tend to be reluctant to step forward. Academic success, according to Joshua, depends on the individual student; whether they have been mainstreamed into his class from bilingual or ESL makes little difference. Joshua feels that he plays a role in the acceptance of language minority students in his classroom. He feels that he is strict and fair and he is challenged by helping students understand the material.

Self-Reported Instructional Practices

As previously stated Joshua uses a developmental strategy to teach his classes and he does not think that this strategy is particularly suited for language-minority students. In fact, it could be harmful to some.

> It doesn't particularly help them because my lessons are designed not for students who are language-minority but for kids that have English capabilities who just aren't used to using those skills. I think that those lessons tend to hurt language-minority kids who could probably use more factual vocabulary in their lessons.

Joshua's rationale for using developmental lessons, even though he is unsure of the effectiveness for language-minority students, stems from the school administration which emphasizes that if students are mainstreamed they are prepared.

Joshua has no idea if the language-minority students understand his lessons because "they (the students) won't let me know what they don't understand. They just sit there, and they just smile and they will be polite." He feels that vocabulary and rate of speech are certainly factors which influence comprehension.

> .....I like to challenge them. I use words that they don't always use. But I think the major part of it is that truly that they although they can understand, some of them can really understand, but it has to be really slow. I can't speak that slow. Because then I feel like I'm speaking beneath another group of students in the class. I'd rather drag them along kicking and screaming to get them up to where they've got to be if they are going to listen to anything. You have to get it at the speed of the speaker.

While Joshua's planning is not influenced by having language-minority students in his class, his lesson implementation is.

> I still do basically the same lessons that I would do in an all English speaking class, the difference is more in the speed. I'm a little bit more deliberate when it comes to my lessons. But I don't take it for granted that they know anything .... vocabulary or anything else.

That "anything else" that Joshua refers to are aspects that need to be developed by all students. These aspects include vocabulary (although in varying degrees) and the ability to make connections. Joshua describes an incident in discussing the Protestant reformation.

> So I am discussing the Protestant reformation and I have to break it down into protest and reform. What do those words mean? And even for the kids who aren't language-minority, they never make the connections.

Joshua has some language-minority students who do not speak in class. Primarily poor English skills and lack of confidence explain the silence of some language-minority students, according to Joshua. He cites pronunciation and culture as lesser reasons. "They either have little or no understanding of English or they are completely unsure of themselves." Handing in homework gives Joshua some indication of English level and Joshua "tries to build up his (the student's) confidence." One instructional strategy that would benefit

those students with little confidence would be giving the student advance preparation. "(First) I'd ask him why he doesn't speak up in class... and tell him that tomorrow I will call on him to discuss this."

For the student who does not hand in homework, Joshua feels restricted by the nature of his job.

> I would love to be able to say (to the student) I would sit down with him and talk to him and I'd say hey you really have to understand, that maybe we can talk to your counselor, but that's totally unrealistic...time constraints. You know you can help these kids, that is what I have come to realize, but in terms of initiating contact with students...I have the time for students that come to me or they show an interest in coming to me. I also have the time to try and help the students along in class. But in terms of pulling a kid aside to talk to him for an extended period, it's almost impossible.

Joshua knows at least 20 kids who need that kind of attention, but the time is not there. "If they aren't going to make the initial effort to show me that's what they want, I can't chase them around."

In addition to lack of confidence, Joshua feels that pronunciation, which is linked to vocabulary, is another reason why some language-minority students neglect to participate in class.

> The kids who I have met have difficulty not only understanding, they can understand the vocabulary which is difficult, verb usage which is monstrous, then they get stuck with the pronunciation.

He exemplifies this situation when his class was discussing desertion.

> Desertion was the word that we were using and I stopped because I knew that I had lost the class. So alright, to desert, to leave, I put that on the board. Then I put up on the board dessert, an after dinner treat. Desert, spelled the same way as a desert, a hot place, and you could see I mean, you could joke about it that all the language-minority kids were...I mean English is a language that can mess people up. So you have desert, dessert, desert. Two of them are pronounced exactly the same, completely different meanings, do the best with it.

Joshua feels that pronunciation has been overlooked for many language-minority students. "They are not going to pronounce the words properly because no one has sat down with them." Joshua tells of a Chinese student who is almost unintelligible when she speaks.

> I have one girl, for the life of her, she really tries hard. I spoke to her father, actually it was through a translator, he doesn't speak a bit of English. She barely speaks English but she comes in every day with her pencil sharpened, a smile on her face ... I'll ask her to pronounce [it] three or four times. If I can't get it I'll ask her to write it down.

Besides asking students to write down answers when they cannot be understood, Joshua frequently repeats student answers. This technique, however, is frowned upon by his department chairman. "My chairman says that I'm working against the student (when I repeat) because the other students don't have to listen to the original response." Joshua disagrees. He learned this technique from a college professor who "told me that by repeating students' answers we reinforce how good the answer is." Joshua feels that repeating students answers is a helpful technique, especially for those students who have pronunciation difficulties, and he will continue to use it, except when his chairman comes to observe. "She told me under no circumstances, she does not want me to repeat the answers again."

Finally, Joshua thinks that culture vaguely contributes to the silence of some language-minority students. "Well, I mean it's possible, anything is possible." According to Joshua, it depends on the national origin of the language-minority student.

> If he (the student) comes from a male dominated society which many of the Latinos do, maybe he is intimidated by the teacher being male? ... I've had female friends who teach language-minority students and they have tremendous problems with the (Latino) boys because they think that young female teachers are a joke.

Joshua feels there are a number of aspects that language-minority students need to know in order to be successful in the mainstream class. First, they need to understand that they are not alone.

> They need to understand that the U.S. is a society of immigrants and that what they are doing now, the troubles that they are having now others have had. Although it might seem that they are the only ones that are suffering, everybody else's parents suffered through the same

> thing ... you feel that you are the only one who is suffering. The more that you come to realize ... lots of people have problems, it makes you feel better. These kids, they've got to understand that it isn't forever.

Joshua suggests seminars of language-minority kids helping language-minority kids where confidence would be built and information could be transfered.

> Since this is a school of immigrants ... well just to have seminars using successes, kids that came into school in 9th grade or 12th grade, take those kids and take them into the ESL kids ... talk about techniques, things that they did to improve their language skills ... Just the idea of helping someone else, it's a matter self worth and confidence.

Self-confidence is another aspect that language-minority students need in order to succeed in the mainstream classroom. Joshua attempts to build confidence in language-minority students by reinforcing improvement. "I try to see what they are doing better. I will reinforce in whatever way that I can." Self-confidence elicits passion from Joshua and he draws from his own high school experience. "I think about how many times that I was told that I was stupid in high school." Building upon students' prior knowledge is another way to build self-confidence and Joshua does this in his lessons.

> I'll start with easy questions that they can answer ... I did that today when we were talking about Jesus and the church and I put it to them ... if you wanted to go out until a certain hour and your parents wanted you home an hour and a half before, what could you do to get your parents to change their minds? What would happen if you came home at 12 and your parents wanted you home at 10:30? Any kid could answer that. No need to have a tremendous vocabulary. So that gets their feet wet, gets them to speak. It's just a matter of building confidence. I'm not going to ask them, well why wasn't the counter reformation successful? You build to the heavy duty questions.

Another important aspect for language-minority students to understand is that English is a challenging language and that in order to be successful, you have to practice everyday. "I've grown up here and I don't speak it that well ... They have to use their dictionaries to look up the words that they don't understand, make a list of them, keep it growing."

Finally, having realistic expectations about progress is essential.

> I've had kids, like the really bad ones who couldn't speak English at all. They could not do the homework because they could not make heads or tails out of the text. Well, basically, they failed the class. They take it over again as their English improves. They eventually will pick up enough, if they don't get frustrated along the way and quit.

Joshua does not know what the ratio of language minority students is who drop out. The point for him is being realistic and adjusting instructional strategies.

> I'm not going to get them to pass the class. They just don't speak English. So I'll tell them that I want them to do the homework, the reading. Choose 15 words, write definitions and then write sentences and I'll give you credit for the homework ... I won't pass them though, it's not legit.

What's important to Joshua is that the students do the best that they can with a situation and be honest.

> If you tell that (student) well, look you are in a situation that is too difficult for you, but you are here let's make the best of it , maybe you won't do it this time, but next time that you try you will be better. I don't want to paint any pictures for them.

Parents must not be given false expectations as well.

> If you don't know English and you come into school in 9th or 11th grade, to expect that kid to graduate on time is ridiculous. To let the kid believe that he is going to graduate is even more ridiculous. To even tell the parents, I mean you have to be out of your mind to tell this kid that you come into school at 16 without speaking English, and you are going to graduate at the end of the year, no chance. I just want to be up front. I don't see the advantage in giving them any kind of illusions that they are better at what they are doing then they are. They may not like it ... but damn it if you don't speak English you aren't going to pass the class.

Where do language-minority students learn what they need to know in order to succeed in the mainstream classroom? According to Joshua, the mainstream teacher has some responsibility "to lay out for what I think are the best ways to study." He feels, however, that teachers are not "miracle workers...I can only ask myself what I can do ... I can't go beyond."

In conclusion, Joshua uses developmental strategies when teaching his classes, although he doubts their effectiveness for language-minority students. Joshua feels that the lack of English skills, and self confidence are the primary reasons why some language-minority students are silent in class. Pronunciation and culture are lesser reasons. He thinks that language-minority students need to understand that they are not alone in their struggle to learn English and he suggests seminars where language-minority students could help other language-minority students. In addition, Joshua sees no advantage in conveying false expectations to language-minority students and their parents about course progress and graduation. Finally, although acknowledging the role that the teacher plays in student success, Joshua asserts that it is the student that makes the ultimate difference.

Professional Development and Support

There is not much support for teachers where Joshua works. In fact, asking for help is a sign of weaknesses or incompetence. Joshua tells of an experience when he was teaching the bilingual Spanish history class.

> After three weeks of teaching I went up to the foreign language department to see if I could get maps or vocabulary lists or anything in Spanish that would help the class ... I told the chairman of my predicament, that I was teaching the bilinguals and that my Spanish was not very good. I asked if there were any materials that would help, textbooks, European history textbooks in Spanish. I can read Spanish well enough so that I could figure out what is being discussed. Not two minutes after I returned to my department I was approached by my chairman telling me that the chairman of the foreign language department doubts my competence. The minute that you say that you need help you are incompetent.

Joshua learned his lesson from that experience and to this day he does not ask for help or resources for fear of losing his job. "I won't do that because there is so much backstabbing around here. I don't need the hassle."

There are a number of resources that Joshua feels would be helpful to him and his students. Among them are bilingual vocabulary lists. "If I could get global studies vocabulary lists in Spanish, Korean and Chinese, I mean to the point where you could give it out at mass levels." Joshua has vocabulary lists in English that he has made for his classes. He would have his students use the bilingual lists as references. "They may know the words in their own language, what communist means in Korean, they just might not know what it looks like in English."

Besides the bilingual vocabulary lists, Joshua would like to have bilingual materials which his school does not have. "You could give kids stuff in their own language, and that is great, but unless it corresponds to the stuff in English, it's a waste." Joshua feels that what is missing are truly bilingual materials. For Joshua that means text in the native language with corresponding translation in English. Joshua does not think that bilingual materials need to be used for a long time, "but when the kids first come it's essential." Joshua elaborates this need for materials.

> I want to teach them in English...when I give out materials, the kids could have it in English and their own language and after awhile it would work as a phasing thing. I would begin by just giving them their own language, then in English and their own language and then just take away their own language. Have them build a little confidence so they can keep up.

In addition to bilingual materials, Joshua's dream would be to have multilingual aides in his classes. "If you gave me a class of language-minority kids, and they grouped them Korean and Chinese and they had an Asian aide who spoke Korean and Chinese, that would be spectacular." His rationale is that "(the aide) could help the student with vocabulary right then and there."

When asked about the possibility of having teachers' aides in his school, Joshua commented about the ESL department. "ESL classes have aides, but they usually only speak English." When Joshua taught in the bilingual program he

used students to help communicate parts of the lesson to other students. He has played with the idea of devising a buddy system "for kids that speak English better than others." The obstacle, according to Joshua is that "a lot of these kids have responsibilities outside of school."

Joshua feels that if he had support from the administration and the responsibility were not solely on him a buddy system might work. He is reluctant to initiate it alone.

> There is so much possibility of mess ups. Just shit and nobody wants shit. It's thrown around so easily, it doesn't really dishearten me, but it makes me more careful in what I do....a buddy system is a great idea as long as a parent doesn't complain to the principal.

There is a program in the school, run through the foreign language department that tries to find tutors for kids, but this program has not been successful, "It's something that really has to be done at the grass roots level. It has to come from the teachers, the teachers really have to push it and they don't."

Joshua asserts that he needs more support and materials rather than actual knowledge in educating language-minority students.

> I mean as far as teaching goes, teaching is the same no matter what kinds of kids that you have. It's really true, it doesn't matter what I'm teaching. If you're a teacher, you're a teacher..... So I mean for myself, I do OK.

He has never had any formal ESL training and he feels that "it would be helpful to know what has been proven to be quite effective with these kids." But he feels comfortable with the job that he is currently doing given the circumstances. "I don't know anything about what the profession deems to be....But then again, I'm kind of happy with the way that I do things now. I think that I'm effective." He feels strongly that if he were to receive training for working with language-minority kids he would not want "somebody who

hasn't been in the classroom for a really long time telling me this is not an effective tool in dealing with language-minority kids."

Joshua does not really feel that training in ESL would be beneficial to him. "I have mixed classes, I have kids who speak English fluently that were born and raised here that have no problem and sitting next to them is a kid who came off the boat from Korea two weeks ago." He feels that there is too much talking (in training) as opposed to doing.

> You get these know-it-all professors telling you what's effective and what's not. We've spent $80,000 on this study. But I ask what did you get in the kids' hands. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out what these kids need. They need stuff they can read that corresponds to what they are learning.

Replace the training with resources. "The stuff that I need are things that I can let these kids have access to on an individual basis as opposed to teaching the whole class." Joshua thinks that once a student has been mainstreamed from ESL or bilingual, then learning English is an individual process. "I can't help them with that (English), that is something they have to do on their own."

Joshua clearly would select resources over training; nevertheless, he has suggestions for training mainstream teachers who educate language-minority students. Included in the training would be developing listening skills, increasing awareness and sensitivity to language-minority students, students and teaching basic skills.

His rationale for including listening skills for mainstream teachers is that teachers "are too busy thinking up the next question that they don't listen to what the kids are saying." Joshua would devise an activity that would place the mainstream teacher in the shoes of the language-minority student. "If somebody handed me a form in Chinese and said, fill it out, well OK I get the point." Many of the teachers teaching these kids do not understand that the

problem is "that kids don't understand what you are talking about." Joshua suggests an inservice session.

> I'd bring somebody in that spoke Chinese and I'd have them speak for 40 minutes to give them (the teachers) what it is like. A 40 minute class. Have this person come in and teach a history lesson in Chinese, have them write on the board in Chinese. And telling you to keep up with that. Have some Chinese people in the room, and you are sitting there going...

Joshua feels that teachers forget the students' perspective and he would include an activity that would get at that point in training. After the 40 minute Chinese exercise he would have teachers discuss what "it would take for them as a student to effectively work in the classroom."

Joshua finds it difficult to imagine a training design for mainstream teachers with language-minority students because most teachers "could care less, a lot of the teachers just don't care." Joshua talks of frustration, apathy and lack of rewards among his colleagues.

> Nobody pats them on the back, nobody tells them...they don't get it financially, emotionally, they don't get it. Most professions, there is a lot of positive reinforcement out there. But if you don't get it why would you give it.

Joshua gets and receives rewards through his purchasing of the yearbook every year. "When I sign a kid's yearbook, they know what I think of them, and when they sign mine I know what they think of me...what impact I've had." Ultimately, for Joshua, his students are people and they deserve to be treated with respect.

> When we are in the classroom, yes I am the teacher and they are the student, and I don't hang out with them and have beers with them. But they are people and they deserve to be treated exactly the way that I would be.

Finally, Joshua believes that the ultimate responsibility in the education of language-minority students lies with the student.

> I think unfortunately with the burdens of the financial situation in this city, with the fact that they are not going to be in nurturing situations that will help them incorporate English into their lives, they are

> responsible for it. They have got to know that they are responsible for it (learning English) and that that is OK. They can do it. People will help them the best that they can, but they are responsible for learning.

In summary, there is not much administrative support for Joshua. Seeking support is frequently more problematic than it is worth. Joshua would take bilingual resources over training. He doubts that ESL training would be helpful to him because his classes are mixed. He feels; however, that mainstream teachers would benefit from practicing listening skills and developing sensitivity to language-minority students. Apathy and lack of rewards are obstacles to teacher development, nevertheless, through involving himself with students, Joshua feels rewarded.

Laura

Laura was born and raised in Connecticut in a "wealthy, suburban town." Since she was two years old, her family has lived in the same house, and Laura has always "felt a strong sense of community" there. Laura is the youngest of three girls. One sister is a speech pathologist in a public school in New England and the other is an accountant living in New York City. Her father is an attorney and under his influence she majored in advertising at Northwestern University. "I never thought of anything but business. As a kid that's all I heard."

Interested in marketing and advertising, Laura majored in Human Development and Social Policy at Northwestern University. According to Laura, the department of human development and social policy was a chance

> to design your own major ... you had core courses and an area of concentration where you could pick and choose all the courses from schools within the university and apply them to your concentration.

Because of falling enrollments in the school of education, the department of human development and social policy was housed in the school of education.

Therefore, Laura took a variety of courses in human and child development and social policy. She took the "whole gamut from prisons, to schools to crime."

Even though Laura was in the school of education, she "had no interest in being a teacher." In fact, "the thought never crossed my mind." Still focused on business, she became interested in social policy, particularly mental illness and mental institutions. During her senior year she did an independent study with a professor who was conducting a longitudinal study which traced the recidivism rate of mental patients. Testing her interest in social policy as a career option, Laura did field work visiting several different after care centers in poverty stricken downtown Chicago. Laura contends that this experience discouraged her from going into the field of social policy.

> I would come home so depressed. I just realized that I couldn't go home and leave it behind, and if you are going to be in a profession like that you really have to.

After graduation, Laura returned home and got a job with a small company that did special event promotions. Her title, sales service coordinator, was misleading because she ended up doing everything from " typing letters to organizing the office." Although Laura was not particularly happy in this small company, she believes that the experience was good.

> With most of my friends in law school or financial analysts, I didn't mind what I was doing, but in a way I was embarrassed. All my life I thought you go to college, get out and then get a great job.

Eventually the company failed and before lay-offs began, Laura resigned. Although consciously uninterested in teaching, Laura's best friend's mother who worked for the Greenwich, Connecticut Board of Education, began to court Laura into the field. Laura substitute taught music and fourth grade a few times. She liked teaching but it did not quite fit the image that she had for herself.

> I liked substituting, but I thought that most of the people in these schools were just these older women. I can't imagine myself being in this kind of environment. Maybe in 10 years, but not now.

Laura had reached a crossroads in her life. She did not want to go back to the "nine to five" world of business. She remembers the day that she began thinking about teaching as a career.

> I had this long talk one day with a friend. I was really upset. I didn't know what to do. We just had this long talk. It's a very good friend of mine that I have known forever. We talked about all different options as far as a career and she mentioned teaching and we talked more and more about it. And she knows me very well and we were saying the pros and cons. She thought that it would be such a terrific job for me. The more that I started thinking about it the more that I thought it would.

As a result, Laura wasted no time collecting information on graduate teaching programs in New York City. She investigated education programs at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York University and Bank Street. By default she ended up at Bank Street because application deadlines had already passed for Teachers College and New York University.

Laura maintains that pursing a masters degree in education was "sort of a whim" and she began with doubts and fears.

> I was kind of nervous that I was going to be putting out all this money and actually at the beginning of the year I was very upset. I went through some very hard times when I thought, is this for me? Now I really believe that it is. In the fall I was just thinking, I invested $50,000 dollars...I was questioning whether I wanted to be a classroom teacher.

During her graduate studies in the teacher education program at Bank Street, Laura focused her courses on the upper elementary grades. "Most of the courses are required courses, there are few electives and you chose depending on what age group you are interested." One of the electives that Laura took was a special education elective; however, in retrospect Laura "wishes there was something for language-minority children."

In addition to courses, Laura student taught. Student teaching was "all year, three days a week at three different placements." She describes her first student teaching placement in a private school as most helpful, although "traditional," in that it was the most similar to her current teaching situation. Traditional, according to Laura means

> the kids sit at desks, and they have textbooks and workbooks. The school is concerned with tests and the curriculum is more directed by the administration.

Laura's other two student teaching placements were in two different public school classrooms in an urban elementary school.

In general Laura feels that her teacher education program was "excellent." She maintains

> I could say now that I do think that it prepared me for as much as I could be prepared in a year. I went from knowing absolutely nothing about, almost nothing about education, to going into a school. I have learned more this year than I learned last year. I do think that it was very good preparation.

In spite of her praise, she is critical of at least one aspect of the teacher education program. Bank Street holds a child-centered philosophy which is not necessarily the way many schools are run.

> I think the public school that I'm (currently) in is much more traditional than Bank Street. So I really have to adapt a lot to where the kids are at. Bank Street doesn't really get in to (public education) like the situation that I am in. I think that it is really geared toward private education, or those alternative public schools.

As a first year teacher, Laura believes that she will be in the classroom for at least five more years. However, her emotions and feelings towards the profession have swung like a pendulum.

> If I had talked to you two months ago, I would have said something different. I went through a period when I was ready to quit right then and there. It was so overwhelming for awhile. But everything is OK now.

In five years Laura sees herself possibly pursuing educational administration. She thinks of the possibilities of becoming more specialized "teaching a specialized class, either special education, ESL, guidance or outdoor education."

In conclusion, Laura's teaching career began indirectly as she struggled with disappointments in the business world and the job market. With the help of her best friend's mother, she began substitute teaching which immediately led her into a teacher education program at Bank Street College. That year of courses and student teaching prepared her for her first and current position as a fifth grade teacher in a public elementary school in Chinatown.

Current Teaching Context

Ninety-five percent of the students in Laura's elementary school are ethnic Chinese. Laura believes that most of the students do not speak English when they begin kindergarten but "by the time they reach fifth grade, a lot of them have command of the English language." Laura describes the socioeconomic status of most of the students in the school as middle class. "I don't think think that any of them are rich. In some of the gifted classes some of the families are higher up on the socioeconomic scale." In Laura's class "19 out of 25 students get a free lunch." When Laura began filling out the federal forms for the lunch program she "was shocked because of the amount of money that these families were living on ... a family of five or six living on anywhere between $12,000 and $25,000 a year." Laura estimates that " 98% of the students in her class have two working parents."

Nevertheless, Laura has met almost all of her students' parents. She has conferenced with many of them, but that has been difficult because "between 50 and 75% of the parents do not speak English." Although the school provides

translators, Laura comments on the lack of depth the parent conferences have and she provides a rationale.

> Other than telling them what their child does, that's about it. I try to elicit things from them in the conversations, but they tend not to contribute. I think that's a cultural thing. The parents think, hey the teacher knows best. So it's hard to get information from the parents.

According to Laura about 35% of the school staff is Chinese. Although Laura describes the school as "a little more traditional than I would like it to be," she feels quite comfortable. "There's a very congenial atmosphere. It's a great school. As far as a public school, it's really a wonderful school." Part of her satisfaction stems from the support she feels from the principal.

> The principal is very supportive and really encourages teachers to seek out programs. Like this (outdoor education) program that I am taking my children on. At the beginning of the year I asked her and she gave me the $1300.00 dollars that we needed.

Moreover, Laura is comfortable with the other teachers in the school, although she relates to each of them differently.

> I feel really comfortable with the other teachers, both older teachers who have been teaching for a long time and younger teachers. I relate to different teachers in different ways....commiserating with the other first year teachers that I know how overwhelming and tough it is. I'm learning a lot from the other teachers who have been there.

Laura's fifth grade class is one of six fifth grade classes. "There's a bilingual combined fourth and fifth grade, a gifted fifth grade and four other fifth grades." According to Laura, this is the first year that students have been heterogeneously grouped to form classes. Laura questions the effectiveness of the school's past practice of homogeneous student grouping.

> I think two or three years ago they (the administration) just had them ranked by standardized scores and they put these 30 kids in this class. Last year they tried something new which was they took the top half and the lower half and mixed those. So that was getting a little more heterogeneously. Well I think this has had ..... the history of my kids being in homogeneous classes has detrimental effects. It definitely affects the way the classroom is now because the kids who had lower standardized scores, not as much was expected of them, and I know it was hard for teachers when they had those classes ..... the

> kids who are brighter really keep the class going and I think the other kids learn so much from them.

A typical day for Laura begins at 8:00 a.m. when she arrives at school. Her first task is to organize materials and write the morning schedule and directions on the board. At 8:40 Laura goes to the yard to pick up her class. "Usually less than half my class is there at 8:40, for some reason other classes seem full." Laura maintains that before New Year's, she used to have a morning meeting but recently she has started to have silent reading so the kids "know what they do when they come in first thing." Furthermore, she asserts that "my day is definitely affected by my class." Laura provides a bit of history on the class that she "inherited."

> My class, the teacher whose class I inherited is Chinese and she has been working for many years. She is supposedly a dynamic teacher and a very strict disciplinarian. She can really handle those hard to handle kids. And every year, she has told me that she gets the hardest class. And so this class that I have .... I've talked to other teachers ... I have some really tough kids in my class.

Because of the nature of her class and "the school, the culture and everything," Laura expresses that "the day has become what the day is at this point of the year ... the day that we have now is not the day that I anticipated before I started teaching."

Nevertheless, there is some sense of routine to Laura's day. After silent reading, she takes time for announcements and "things that need to be discussed." A few days every week, Laura has early preparation periods, however, she likes to "fit into the morning some kind of language activity."

> We do whole class novels which is kids either reading silently or I give them a chapter and we have mini-lessons. I'm trying to incorporate the theme of survival and the environment.

The language activity usually takes the class to lunch.

Lunchtime for Laura, is not described as "leisurely." She usually eats in her classroom and tries to do some work. Laura eats lunch in the teachers' room or the cafeteria infrequently because

> I find that I need some time not to talk. I'm talking so much all day long. I like the teachers, they all go to the teachers' room, but I find that I have a lot of work to do and I don't really want to talk.

At 12:30 Laura picks her students up and they begin every afternoon with math. Math lessons are fairly traditional as her class "has been going through the textbook." Laura tries to relate math to real life situations and she describes what she calls "short math lessons."

> We just had a major fund raiser yesterday, this flea market all day long and for the last two weeks I have been incorporating the short math lesson into that and giving homework.

Laura contends that they "always have math and language everyday." Other than math and language they "will do science-oriented things." Laura describes the end of the day as "always rushed" and that is distressing. "I think that these kids need more time for me to explain the homework, and lots of times they go home and I don't really think that it's explained well enough."

Half of Laura's class leaves early everyday to go to the CPC (Chinatown Planning Council Committee) until 6:00 p.m. At the CPC, "the kids have to do their homework immediately." Laura maintains that "that's cultural." She compares her students' parents work ethic to that of her father's. "Their parents are eeking out a living. They have the working ethic, like my father had." Therefore, because of the CPC program, "there is nothing that I can really do with the rest of the kids" the last 15 minutes of class. Laura enjoys this time however, having only 10 or 15 students in the class from 2:45 until 3:00.

Laura struggles with her emotions during the day. "So much of it depends on four or five kids in my class who really play with my emotions."

Many of her frustrations stem from the fact that her expectations as a first year teacher have not necessarily been met; she believes she lacks structure and confidence.

> Usually I start the day in a pretty good mood, even with all this overwhelmingness [sic] and the problems and everything. I usually go in thinking good ideas, today is going to be great, better than yesterday, whatever. Sometimes I go in with a mind set, OK I have to get strict with these kids today. Because I think that part of the reason I'm having such a hard time with these kids is that I haven't. I came in not being very structured, confident. I don't know exactly what my management techniques would be. These kids have gotten away with a lot and I just didn't really expect that they would take advantage and they really, really have.

Laura maintains that she is "doing the best that she can" but has wrestled with perceptions of her ability and the reality of being a classroom teacher.

> I went in wanting to be the best teacher that I can be and providing all these things for the class, now in the fall, I'm just not a really good teacher right now. It upset me and everything, but at this point this is all I can do. I have to have another life also or else I'm going to be burned out in a month. So I am doing the best that I can and I figure I am going to learn as I go along.

Laura compares her class to that of her students when she student taught at an alternative school.

> Where I did my student teaching in this alternative school the kids liked school. And that was the way, in that school kids liked school. In this school, in general, the kids don't like school. They would rather not be in school and that rather hurt me, because I want them to like school.

Laura's perception that the kids in her class do not like school may be a result of a few students that are behavior problems. One student in particular causes difficulties.

> I have a child Mike, who just drives me crazy, absolutely no self-control, no remorse. It's a constant battle. I know that he was labeled emotionally disturbed. He has counselling and I know that they (the administration) want him mainstreamed. Actually the school doesn't have a special education class.

Not all of Laura's 28 students cause problems. She has two students for example who are artistically gifted. The school does not offer art, and Laura wishes that she could do some "free-style Bank Street type painting" but at this point she doubts her ability to design any lesson that is free. "I haven't found that I can handle that in the classroom."

In general, Laura believes that "kids that are verbal whether or not they are bright" are the easiest to teach because she "knows a lot more about the kids who are verbal." She maintains that "it's hard to get to know the kids that don't express themselves verbally or in writing." She feels that this creates negative feelings towards her less expressive students which includes the language-minority kids.

> Some of my ESL kids in particular and some of my other kids, are not verbal or writers. I definitely feel like I know them, but a lot of it is not really in a positive way.

Laura usually plans her lessons the night before, because she discovered problems when she tried to plan for a whole week. "I found that when I tried to do a whole week ... it never comes close to what I've planned." She has an idea what the class will be doing week to week but

> generally the specifics, the types of questions I'm going to ask and the way I'm going to present a lesson I sort of plan the day before. Or there are times when I think of things off the top of my head. I find that sometimes that works great.

Laura describes an impromptu math lesson which resulted from the class discussing the Super Bowl. "I ended up making a whole math lesson out of it, completely off the top of my head. So I thought that was great."

Laura confesses that her lesson plans are very general and she knows that the administration would like her to include "the motivation, aim and all that stuff." Laura however, "doesn't bother with that stuff." Laura does not feel that the administration restricts what she can and cannot do in the

classroom although the fifth grade curriculum is set. The curriculum "is supposed to be set, but really I have a lot of flexibility with what I want to do." She does feel restricted; however, by her students and by herself. "I'm prevented from doing what I want because of the kids and what they are used to and what I can handle right now."

Laura thinks that her class is a little behind in math but she is more concerned and perhaps confused with language arts. With the class novel, her students have learned a lot about story and language and she gives them specific skill lessons usually after she assigns a writing.

> I try to pick things out of their writing that I think needs to be focused. But I would like to do that more because I'm concerned that I'm not doing enough of it.

Along with her concerns, Laura has doubts and questions about language acquisition and use.

> I wonder if it's something, do all kids not use 'don't' or 'doesn't' or is it because English is their second language? The big concern of mine is whether ..... their grammar is not right because English is their second language? I notice that most of the kids that are more proficient in English write with more correct grammar and those are the kids that speak English better. Kids who are slower, who aren't as good in math even with computation where you don't need to know the language, haven't picked up English as well. It sort of makes sense!?

Laura attempts to straighten out her confusion by relating her own experiences in learning a second language but still ends up with doubts.

> I mean I consider myself a pretty bright person, but then again I really do have a lot of trouble with language. I did well with language on paper in school, but speaking I've never been one to pick up languages easily. So I know from personal experience it's not just... how much you have up here (points to head) that it's more of an individual thing. But I'm not sure what that has to do with it?

Finally, Laura concludes her thoughts with as much doubt as she began, using examples of two of her students.

> Chung-Hua was in a bilingual class last year, but his English is really good. He really has no problems communicating and we can talk freely. Whereas I have another student who has never been in an ESL

> or bilingual class, and she is very, very slow. I have referred her to special education because she has a lot of academic problems and I'm not sure. I know that she started kindergarten speaking Chinese but I'm not sure if her English just isn't good, or she can't communicate that well. I don't know!!

In conclusion, Laura's first year teaching in an ethnic Chinese urban elementary school has not been particularly easy, although she feels supported by the principal and the teaching staff. Some of her struggles are with student behavior, classroom management and confidence. For Laura, students who are expressive, whether it be verbal or oral, are easier to teach. With so many bilingual students, Laura has questions and doubts her students' language abilities and use.

Language-Minority Students

Of Laura's 28 students, four are pulled out for ESL every morning first period. It is these four students, Ting-Ting, Fan, Chung-Hua, and Jia-Ming, who are the focus of this section, although all of Laura's students in some sense, are language-minority.

Ting-Ting

Ting-Ting, according to Laura, is "really the outcast of the class." Laura thinks that she was born in the United States and is not sure if her native language is Mandarin or Cantonese Chinese.

> She is a little different from the rest of the girls. I think that most of the kids in the class consider her strange. I remember the first day of school I had all the kids sitting on the floor and Ting-Ting walked in late, and when she walked in there was a sound 'Ugggggg' from the class. I'll never forget that because it was my first contact with the class.

Not only is Ting-Ting pulled out for ESL every morning, but as a result of her evaluation by the committee on special education, she goes to resource room and counseling. That poses somewhat of a problem because "she is out of the

class quite often." And when she is in the classroom "she often has her own agenda from what we are doing, she is doing something else. She is drawing, she draws a lot. She is not particularly good, but she draws." Laura classifies her as "different from the rest of the kids, obsessive." Laura tells of an unforgettable incident with Ting-Ting.

> Our class took a trip to the beach and we found a butterfly that was almost dead. A couple of kids in the class actually found it but the ranger and myself went over. The ranger said that we could keep it because it was going to die. Ting-Ting took it and she was so obsessive with it. She kept petting it. The whole rest of this trip, she had this butterfly in hand and she didn't want anyone else to see it. She wanted to keep it all to herself. She was really obsessive about it.

That was the first time that Laura had noticed "that personality trait."

In addition to being obsessive, Laura notices that she is "very clingy with adults .... maybe it's showing affection, it depends on the way that you look at it. From my perspective it's more annoying." Ting-Ting does not have many friends, and Laura acknowledges how difficult that can be. "At that age, they (the other kids) can be pretty brutal." Nevertheless, Laura finds it hard to give Ting-Ting the attention that she demands.

> She will often come up to the classroom during lunch or if she leaves resource room on Fridays for example, she has to go directly to music to meet the class. But quite often she'll come in the classroom and say 'I don't want to go to music, can't I stay, don't you have anything for me to do?' She wants to stay with me alone doing something, or she will seek out other teachers in the school. I'm sure it has to do with not having friends, but there is something in her personality. I think that even if the other kids accepted her, I don't think that she would have a lot of friends.

Laura has never met with Ting-Ting's parents. "They have never come to a conference and they don't speak English." Laura is not sure if Ting-Ting

> actually lives with her parents ... she lives in a middle income apartment building right next to school and I think she might live with her grandmother. But she does talk about her mother.

Laura describes Ting-Ting's ability to communicate in English and the other students' reaction.

> You can understand her but she has a very difficult time remembering English words. And quite often in the class when she is trying to say something, I try and encourage her to say it in English and even if she doesn't know the word at least use other words to explain what it is. But the other kids right away will chime in to help her. She'll say it to them in Chinese and they will say the word in English.

Nevertheless, Laura believes that Ting-Ting "is not really intimidated to speak" and she does not "think that Ting-Ting feels self-conscious." She does not participate a lot in class, but " she does get excited when she feels she knows the answer and will raise her hand." Laura wonders about Ting-Ting's academic ability and the school's grade promotion policy. "If the school did not have this policy I wonder if she would have made it this far, because she is very far behind academically." Although below grade level in math, Laura feels that she is "doing OK." She is concerned however about Ting-Ting's language skills and Laura speculates the causes of her difficulties.

> In English and in language, I guess it's a combination of her not knowing English and her learning disability, if she has an actual disability. Whatever it is, she is a slow learner.

Fan.

Fan, the second of Laura's four language-minority students who is pulled out for ESL, is also "an outcast." Fan used to leave class for resource room but does not anymore since his triennial evaluation. He does have a speech problem; however, so he is out of the class for ESL, counseling and speech at least one period a day and two periods three times a week. Laura describes Fan as "not your average kid." In class he

> floats up out of his seat, just kind of moving around in a daze. Or sitting in his seat in a daze. He doesn't really have any friends in the class. And a few of the kids, I've heard them making fun of him. Like in front of me, so I tend to think that he gets picked on a lot, because of his speech problem.

Laura calls his speech problem serious and although she has not heard him speak Chinese, she's been told that his difficulties are in Chinese, too.

> I wish you could hear him talk. He can't get the words out. His voice is really squeaky. He can't speak fluently, it's broken up and he really has to concentrate in order for him to get the words out that you can understand.

Laura has spoken to Fan's father through a translator at parent conferences and at the triennial evaluation. Laura perceives Fan's father as "passive" as he is leaving decisions about Fan up to the school. Laura contends that "Fan doesn't have friends the way the other boys have friends." She amplifies what she means.

> I get the feeling that the boys that are nice to him ... there are a lot of boys that are mean to him. There have been comments about his speech and he is also very slow. His actions in some ways are very deliberate. He's got a very slow pace and it takes him awhile to do things. But often when the kids have time to do things on their own they can choose to work with whoever they want. He is often by himself.

Nevertheless, Laura has recently observed more positive interactions between Fan and some of the boys in the class through super hero Marvel cards.

> Lately I have noticed that the boys are involved with these Marvel cards. These characters like wolverine, they have character profile sketches on the back. They are like baseball cards and kids have books of them. So Fan had been getting involved with the other kids about these cards.

In terms of his participation in class, Laura feels that his speech problem prevents him from participating more than being limited English-proficient. Laura believes that his abilities in English are "not that bad."

> Well, his writing is not that bad. It seems like if he had proper articulation he would be able to communicate in English. I think his receptive English skills are good. I don't find that he gets confused when he is spoken to. He just has trouble getting it out. I think it's his speech.

Even with his speech problems and lack of friends, Laura perceives Fan as "a nice kid. He tries really hard and he wants to have friends, but I guess a lot has to do with his speech."

Chung-Hua.

The third of Laura's four language-minority students who is pulled out for ESL every morning is Chung-Hua. Because many of the students in Laura's class were born in the United States, Laura is not sure where Chung-Hua is from. His native language is Chinese, however. In addition to being pulled out for ESL every morning, Chung-Hua leaves the class for Title I reading and counseling. "He is out of the room at least once a day and sometimes twice a day." To make matters more complicated, Title I reading conflicts with ESL, so Chung-Hua misses Title I twice a week. Laura thinks that Chung-Hua was in the bilingual fourth-fifth grade class last year, but she is not sure.

Laura referred Chung-Hua to the committee on special education for emotional problems and that was when she had the opportunity to meet with Chung-Hua's father. Laura believed that Chung-Hua's father spoke English, but he attended the meeting with a friend who served as a translator. "I guess he felt it was really important and he is not completely proficient in English." According to Laura, Chung-Hua has friends but she questions why.

> Personally I don't know why some of these kids are friends with him but I don't know what is going on. I find it very difficult to communicate with Chung-Hua. I guess a lot of it is his English, I'm not really sure.

As far as his behavior in the class, Laura believes that it is frequently inappropriate.

> He acts very very inappropriately in the classroom. He constantly just shouts completely inappropriate comments out for no reason. He walks into the classroom, every time he goes out he walks back in again with his hands flailing, sauntering, all the kids turn their head and look at him. Lots of times he'll raise his hand and then when I call on him he'll say he doesn't know or something. And that very well could be that he can't explain himself in English. I'm not sure, I just can't figure it out.

Jia-Ming.

Laura's fourth and final language-minority student who is pulled out for ESL is Jia-Ming. Laura is not sure where he is from, but she does know that he recently returned to school after living in Vermont with his mother for two years. Laura believes that he experienced problems with the other kids when he returned. Laura describes Jia-Ming as a "momma's boy" and she feels that his mother is "overprotective."

> She picks him up everyday after school. She wouldn't let him go on a trip. We had an overnight trip and she didn't let him go. She told me that she didn't want Jia-Ming to go on the trip because she was sick and he had to take care of her. She needed him. And then she came into school a week or two later and the trip wasn't for another few weeks. I asked her how she was feeling and she said, 'Oh not so much better.' I told her that Jia-Ming could always go on the trip last minute. But I think that was partially an excuse. I think that she is very dependent on him, but he is very dependent on her. I don't think that either one of them is very strong really.

Jia-Ming is the only one of the four students who is pulled out only for ESL. Laura has him in the classroom more than the others because he does not go to resource room, counseling, Title I or speech. She believes that he is "an average student, maybe a little below." Emotionally, Laura feels that his behavior is below grade level.

> He constantly comes up to me and tells me that people are doing things to him. He's the only kid in the class who does that a lot. It's more of a fourth grade, third grade thing. By the time that kids are in fifth grade they don't tell on each other that much.

Jia-Ming's mother disagrees with Laura's assessment of Jia-Ming's emotional level as he is applying to junior high school next year. The district has a new policy where fifth graders can skip sixth grade to begin junior high school. Laura thinks that Jia-Ming might be applying to junior high school "because he is not happy in this school." Regardless of the reason, Laura does not believe that this would be a good idea for Jia-Ming, and her opinion is not based on the fact that he is limited-English proficient.

> I think that he is very immature. As far as language, academically he is very slow. He is the kid that I'm not sure if English is really difficult for him. I'm not sure why he is in ESL. Academically, he doesn't do very well and socially he is behind. I don't think he is ready for junior high school.

In fact, toward the end of the school year, Laura began discussing Jia-Ming at the pupil personnel committee meetings because she was concerned with his academic progress and low self-esteem.

> I think he needs extra help and I think that he's got a lot of emotional things going on. He always does his homework and he always gets it right, but I never really see him do that much in class ... I don't think that he is academically coming along. I don't think that he really understands a lot of the concepts ... I know that part of it is his low self-esteem. I guess I really don't know that but he gets teased a lot by the others in the class ... Some of the things that he says you can tell are upsetting to him. I haven't actually heard him say a lot of negative things about himself. Maybe he doesn't. I know that he wants to have friends, he has said that.

Laura feels bad that it has taken her so long to act on Jia-Ming's problems and she attributes her negligence to the fact that Jia-Ming is a language-minority student.

> I feel like, I feel bad that it's taken me a long time to see what is going on. Maybe, because the fact that he is a language-minority or supposedly language-minority kid, I might have attributed it to that. I can't say.

Moreover, Laura realizes that she might have misassessed Jia-Ming's English language ability. She was recently surprised when it was time for her class to take the standardized reading tests.

> I did ask him if he wanted to take the reading test, one of the standardized tests they give in the spring. Any of the kids that go to ESL, they are allowed to take it in their native language and he said that he wanted to take it in Chinese. So I guess he does feel more comfortable with Chinese. I don't really see him as having much of a problem with language difficulty.

Laura rationalizes her misconception of Jia-Ming's language as a result of her inexperience with language-minority students. "But yes this is my first class

ever and these are the kids that go to ESL...they all have other problems that compounds their lack of proficiency in English."

Laura is perplexed when it comes to understanding her four language-minority students who are pulled out for ESL and she believes that it is not just the language that is creating problems.

> I just don't know, I think that the ESL kids have a lot of other problems besides ESL. I mean all four of the kids. Because they all have other problems, and then I have seen other kids. I have one kid in my class who came to the United States a year before last. He came, was in bilingual for a year, now he's in the regular class. His English is fine and he is not in ESL. He is an average student so it isn't that he's just so intelligent that he can pick up English so quickly. But he doesn't have these other problems. I just get the feeling that there is something that everything combined that they are in ESL, counseling, this and that.

Moreover, she is frustrated and feels inadequate in her ability to understand just what is going on inside of these students.

> These kids that just have something different about them are just so hard for me to figure them out. If you ask me about 20 of the other kids in the class, I could probably say, yes I know all these things about them.

Nevertheless, as the school year progresses, Laura believes that she is getting to know her language-minority students better and she attributes this mainly to time and possibly to the fact that she has been participating in this study.

> Since the last time we talked, I think that I'm feeling that I'm getting to know those kids better. Those language-minority kids were some of the hardest to get to know..... I think also that it's just taken more time to get to know them. Here it is May already, I feel that way with all the kids, I'm getting to know them all better, But particularly the ESL kids.

For Laura, the most challenging aspect in working with language-minority kids is to understand what they are saying or writing and she believes that patience is important. Laura expresses the difficulties she faces especially with her students' writing.

> In writing, having to teach them, this is all the kids in my class with the exception of maybe five or six, their grammar is just so different. There is no plural in Chinese so they don't use plurals and they use the wrong tenses of verbs. I'm sure all kids do that, but I think, I don't know how to teach them.

Laura believes that being bilingual is a gift and she expresses that to her class especially before she teaches a specific language skill lesson like plurals.

> I have also talked to them about how wonderful that they are bilingual whether they know it or not. It is really going to be great when they are older that they know two languages.

She emphasizes to her class the importance of studying English and not being ashamed of their Chinese language. In fact, she "has tried to learn bits of Chinese, and I have showed them how, what they have accomplished by learning two languages."

Laura does not believe that there are problems between the four language-minority students who are pulled out for ESL and the rest of the students in the class. And although Laura is not aware of school-wide politics between the bilingual and regular classes, she describes what happened at a beginning of the year conference.

> From the beginning of the year when we were having conferences and I remember it was either the principal or other teachers saying how they wanted there to be more interaction between bilingual and regular classes, because the kids in the regular classes looked down on the kids in the bilingual classes.

Laura is not exactly sure about programs for language-minority students in her school; however, she believes that there are two different approaches. One of the two approaches that Laura mentioned is the bilingual approach and Laura believes that these classes are for recent immigrants. She describes what she believes is the purpose of the bilingual classes.

> It's a lot of language in those classes. The kids are really focused on language acquisition, English. I would say that the philosophy is,this had nothing to do with the school, this is what I think of a bilingual class, is to integrate them into the regular class. The approach is to continue their learning in their native language while helping them acquire English. As soon as they have enough English that they can handle a regular classroom, they are taken out of the bilingual class.

In Laura's school, the bilingual classes are called "bridges," or transitional bilingual programs. "Rather than just immersing them in a regular class from the beginning they do it slowly so the kids aren't traumatized." Laura is not exactly sure what specifically happens in the bilingual classroom, but she nevertheless has an opinion about it's effectiveness.

> Well, it's hard for me to say about bilingual, because I don't have any contact with, I mean I really don't know what is going on in those classrooms. I do have the one kid in my class who was in bilingual and something was effective. He learned English and he is in the regular classroom and he is doing fine.

The other programmatic approach that her school employs is ESL pull-out. "Supposedly every kid who has a surname that isn't 'American' has to take a test, and if they don't pass it then they go to ESL." Like the bilingual classes, Laura is unsure of what goes on in the ESL classroom.

> The ESL, it's I'm not really sure what they do in there. I really, I feel like I should know, but I don't really know exactly what they do. I think they have a lot of chances to speak. It's a smaller group and it's probably less intimidating.

Laura is unsure of the effectiveness of the ESL pull-out approach. Her colleagues are unsure too.

> I don't see huge improvements of English in any of the kids, since the beginning of the year. Any improvements that they have shown, well, it's just because they are around English speaking kids, or if the class has helped them I'm not sure. Other teachers, well actually, I've heard other teachers talking, not necessarily about ESL, but about pull-out. Just speaking negatively about them. Just, 'oh they don't do any good.' But I can't make a judgment because I really don't know.

In conclusion, although Laura believes that her entire class is bilingual, she is perplexed about the four language-minority students who are pulled out for ESL. She believes that language alone is not the cause of these four students' difficulties in school. Trying to understand what her language-minority students say and write is most challenging for Laura, and she feels that patience is a necessary quality. Laura is not sure of the specifics of the programs that her school employs for language-minority students, but she is

aware of the major approaches. She has limited contact with the bilingual and ESL teachers. Laura is hesitant to recommend a better approach in working with language-minority students because she believes that she is too inexperienced to know.

Self-Reported Instructional Practices

Laura's classroom is small and her students are seated in clusters of desks. None of the four language-minority students are seated in the same group. Her criteria for arranging students is compatibility and heterogeneous mixes. And although her students are seated in clusters, she wishes that she could do more group work and more activities that are meaningful to the students' lives. But as a first year teacher, she is sometimes grateful just to get through the lesson. In math, for example, she more frequently than not follows the book.

> In general we mostly use the textbook. This is not what I had planned at all, because at Bank Street and my student teaching, I learned completely different ways of teaching math. But I'm just finding it difficult in using manipulative materials with 28 kids and I'm there by myself. I've got more than I can handle. I've also been trying to incorporate some other lessons that are more group activities. I'm working with a lot of things.

Nevertheless, Laura feels that she uses a variety of activities in her class and she believes that some of them could be effective with language-minority students. For example, she describes a math lesson, where the students were asked to draw a triangle, parallelogram and quadrilateral, measure the length of the sides, record the measurements and describe what they did. The purpose of the activity was to understand perimeter. Laura believes that the verbal and written directions were clear, and she was pleased that the students "were doing something physical." She thinks that an activity

such as this is effective with language-minority students because "their understanding was reinforced through the visual, concrete."

In teaching writing and grammar, Laura is less sure of the effectiveness of her instructional strategies and she wishes she could learn "what the best approach in teaching" them is.

> I mean, I will specifically have a lesson, 'this is when we use don't and this is when we use doesn't.' But they just have to practice it in their speaking. I just correct them so they know ... I would love to learn what the best approach is in teaching them grammar. How important is it? I think that it is important, but my approach is more of getting them just to write and not concentrate as much on the grammar. But that really is important. I think that I'm a little bit negligent in that area. But they need it (grammar).

One way that Laura checks her language-minority students' understanding of a lesson is by their responses. However, this is not always effective because Chung-Hua, for example, frequently shouts out irrelevant answers, and Fan is difficult to understand because of his speech problem. Yet, it's Ting-Ting who Laura worries about the most. She often falls back on Chinese and Laura tries to encourage her to respond by using as much English as possible.

> Ting-Ting, she's a different story. She is the one person in the class who when I speak I am very conscious that her English is not that good. She is really the one that I make, in my mind when I'm speaking to her, thinking that I have to speak a little differently and make sure that she understands everything as I go along.

Laura knows when Ting-Ting does not understand sometimes by the look on her face. Frequently, Ting-Ting will say, "I don't understand." Laura tries to rephrase things differently for Ting-Ting, but is frustrated with time.

> Sometimes I don't have the luxury of having time. She comes up a lot at the end of the day and she says that she doesn't know how to to do the homework. Usually, I'll write it on the board, and if it's something that needs to be discussed, I'll discuss it with the class. She'll come up to me at the end of the day. When most kids do that I can go over it with them and it won't take forever. But with her I know that it will take forever for her to understand.

If Ting-Ting still does not understand the homework after Laura has rephrased the instructions, sometimes Laura will change the assignment.

> I hate to admit this, but sometimes I will give her something else. I'll say instead of that why don't you do this, something that I know is easier for her. And I think that's good. It's too advanced. She's also academically poor. Other times, I'll just say try and do your best. At the end of the day there are just a million other things to do. I feel awful about it. I can't do it. I can't spend 15 minutes with her at the end of the day when there are 20 kids who are trying to ask me questions, or to get the class ready to leave.

Laura blames part of the reason for Ting-Ting's problems with understanding assignments on her pull-out classes. "She is not in the classroom everyday, she is out so often, ESL, resource room." She confesses that although she does not know exactly what goes on in ESL or resource room, she is glad that Ting-Ting has these extra classes.

> When she is in the classroom, I have a really difficult time getting her to do the work. She is the kind of kid that needs attention. She is very very needy. I don't know exactly what she does in resource room, I think at least if she has individual attention for a whole period everyday. And with ESL, it's a small group. I think that probably it is better for her. Maybe if she were in the class for a whole day things would change and she would probably get more involved in the class.

Sometimes, the other students are quick to jump in and Laura sees the advantages and disadvantages of teaching a class where many of the language-minority students speak the same language.

> The kids in the class are lucky that they all speak in the same language because they can help each other out. On the other hand, they talk in Chinese together so they are not learning.

Laura believes that she speaks differently to language-minority students individually, than she does when she speaks to the entire class.

> I have the luxury of speaking with them informally of really gearing my speech to what I think they can understand. I probably speak a little differently to them individually than when I speak to the class as a whole. When I speak to the class as a whole I want to insert some words that, I don't want to keep it on such a basic English level because I want the other kids in the class to be stimulated by hearing bigger words, to expand their vocabulary. Usually what I do is try to say things two different ways.

Laura admits that having language-minority students in her class does not affect her planning. She thinks of the class more as a "whole" and focuses on "what she thinks will interest her students and how appropriate the materials are."

> I definitely think of the class more as a whole. And when I think about individualizing I don't really think about language-minority kids. I think more about how academically capable the kids are. I think about the kids who are more capable, to be more challenging for them so they won't be bored. And also keeping it so at least the other kids who are at the lower end of the academic scale are not going to be completely lost.

According to Laura, not all of her four language-minority students are at the lower end of her class academically. She considers Fan more "upper average."

Laura thinks that math is easier for language-minority kids because they "don't really have to express themselves, they are just figuring things out." They also do better in science, although Laura does not do much science with them because they have another science teacher. The science activities that Laura has done with her class are much more "hands on." She acknowledges the fact there is more language in science, but she believes that there is language in math in the form of problem-solving. She is concerned that her language-minority students "do not do well in problem-solving" partially because of the language and the math.

Laura believes that language-minority students in her class do not need help adjusting socially because they can "just speak in their native language with the other kids." She does feel that language-minority kids need encouragement and patience from others in order to succeed in the mainstream classroom. In addition, they themselves need to be persistent in learning English and subject material. Finally, Laura feels that the teacher needs to understand their academic and language needs and needs to adapt instruction.

As far as participating in the class, they need encouragement, they

> need other people to be tolerant, they need to be persistent themselves. If they have a low tolerance level or frustration that would be bad for them. They need the teacher to acknowledge their academic or language weakness and the teacher should try and adapt a little.

Laura questions the role of the ESL class in helping language-minority students adjust to the mainstream classroom.

> I'm thinking right now myself about the pull-out ESL and how that helps them function in the classroom and I'm really not sure. I don't know what they do in ESL and I think that it's something with just learning English. That's OK because it is probably helpful, but I'm thinking what would probably be helpful is for them to learn strategies for coping in the classroom. And so they know what to do when they don't understand words.

Laura maintains that all kids need to know learning strategies but she thinks that language-minority students have a greater need. She is unsure of her abilities.

> I don't know that I could possibly teach them, I guess. ESL would be a good place for that .... I try to do that with the kids in my class as a whole. To make them aware of their own learning strategies and give them other strategies ... When you are aware of how you learn and what you need to do, it helps you. So, they (language-minority students) have a greater need to learn what to do in the classroom so that they can, so that it will benefit them the most.

Laura believes that language-minority students, in order to succeed in school need support on a variety of levels.

> ... from their teacher, from their parents, through the support of the school in full. The administration needs to support the teachers and parents. The ESL teachers as well. They need support from all those places.

In conclusion, the realities of being a first year teacher and the nature of her class, have prevented Laura from using the kind of instructional strategies that she learned in graduate teacher education program and through her student teaching. Nevertheless, she attempts to use instructional strategies that are interesting and appropriate to her students. Laura is much more focused on her class as a whole; therefore, individual needs of language-minority students are not an initial factor when she plans and executes her

lessons. She believes that language-minority students need a wide range of support in order to succeed in the regular classroom. In addition, the language-minority student himself/herself, plays a key role.

Professional Development and Support

According to Laura there is no formal support for mainstream teachers in her school for working with language-minority students. "Nothing formal, it's just me going to another teacher." Laura has spoken to the ESL teacher a few times for the purpose of gathering information on her four students.

> I've talked to the ESL teacher a few times. It wasn't really about how to teach them better. It was more of what her perceptions were of kids. It was more talking about the individual kids.

Although Laura feels that the ESL teacher is accessible, she has hesitated in asking for help and wishes that working with regular teachers was part of the ESL teacher's job.

> I hesitate a little because I know that everyone has so much work. If it was more something that was part of their job, then I would not feel in the least bit hesitant. They are busy, I'm not really sure how they are going to respond.

Laura believes that what is missing in schools is a place where teachers can talk about issues and this has implications for staff development.

> I think that with language-minority kids and just in general, that that is something that is missing in the schools. That there is not much of a forum for teachers to talk about issues.

One suggestion Laura has that would attend to the above complaint and increase her effectiveness with language-minority students is "lunch time workshops." Her school has had lunch time workshops and teachers have attended. At these workshops, Laura imagines

> hearing about other problems that other teachers are having and ways that they have dealt with it. Strategies that they use. You could even hear about other projects that are being done in other classrooms.

In addition to being informative, Laura believes that lunch time workshops would take the place of her having to seek out other teachers for advice or information.

Laura believes there are materials that would be useful to her in her classroom, but she doesn't know what they are. "I'm sure that there are materials but I don't know anything specifically." And since there is no money in the budget, Laura does not see the point in searching for materials. "If I don't have it (money), I'm not going to look for it (materials)."

Laura has never had any formal training in working with language -minority students. Her school has had staff development days and Laura remembers that one of the workshops was teaching ESL through puppets. She did not choose to attend the ESL session because it did not address her needs.

> I didn't take it. There was something else that had a higher priority. It was a specific teacher that had specific projects, building toothpick bridges that involved science and math, and some social studies too.

Laura believes that she might have selected the ESL workshop if it were more appropriate to her and her students' needs.

> With the teaching of ESL it was through puppetry. And I didn't really see that it was useful for me now. I didn't see that I was going to bring puppets in the classroom, at least for now. So if it were different, if it were ESL with other kinds of materials. Something that I thought I would use this year.

It is hard for Laura to imagine what kind of training she would like to have about language-minority students. She would; however, attend ESL workshops if they were practical.

> I can't be specific ... just practical ideas of things to do. A little bit of theory and learning about the research, but also what to do in the classroom. Things that I can take back and use immediately.

She understands that teachers must adapt what they learn in "hands on" workshops yet, she believes they are helpful.

> Every class is different, but I have been to workshops where I have gotten things that I can adapt. My education at Bank Street was very

> practical. I've taken things and adapted them to my class. And I've been to some other workshops this year, actually I went to a science workshop and I've been able to take things back. And definitely you have to adapt. But I think that teachers going into a workshop need to know that. This is what I do with my class and this is what you can do with your class. Take this and mold it any way that would fit in your class.

Overall, Laura does not feel competent in working with language-minority students. "I don't feel prepared and the lack of preparation makes me feel frustrated. I think that it's individual with the kids." She wishes she could learn to be more skilled in assessing the needs of language-minority students.

> I'd like to learn how to identify better when a language-minority student, whether their problem originated from language or something else. If I can't assess their needs, I may not be using the right strategies or helping them with a strategy, or solving whatever problems that they are having. I think that it is essential for a teacher with any student to know what the needs are.

Working with language-minority kids was not a priority for Laura this year, and she is not sure that it will be a priority next year. Yet, as a first year teacher, there is much that Laura needs to learn.

> Well, some of the things that I want to work on involve language. I think that my strengths are more in science and math, so I want to work more on teaching writing, and doing things with reading and language. It wasn't my first priority this year and I don't know if it will be my first priority next year. But it is one of those things that I will be able to spend more time finding out information....maybe attending a workshop or a conference.

Ultimately, Laura believes that the responsibility of educating language-minority students lies with parents, school administration, teachers and the students themselves. For Laura, collaboration is the key.

> I don't think that you can say that it ultimately rests with one person. I think that all education has to be a partnership and one of the problems is there isn't enough communication between regular teachers, ESL teachers, parents. It has to be a partnership.

In conclusion, Laura believes that she would benefit from having time with other teachers to discuss issues which could include those of language-minority students. She has not had any formal training in working with

language-minority students and she does not feel particularly competent. The kind of training that would be helpful to her would be "hands on." Laura feels that the responsibility of educating all children lies within a partnership of parents, teachers, administrators and the students themselves. Laura maintains that collaboration is necessary.

In the next chapter an analysis and discussion of the case histories is presented. The cases are compared, contrasted and related to the literature.

Chapter V

Cross-Case Analysis and Discussion

The purpose of this study is to examine the beliefs, self reported practices and professional development needs of three mainstream teachers with language-minority students. Understanding the perspectives of the three teacher informants through open-ended interviews may be an initial step to ultimately providing support to the growing number of mainstream teachers with language-minority students in the regular classroom.

In this chapter the case histories of the three teacher informants are compared and contrasted through a cross-case analysis. Similar and dissimilar experiences that focus on the teachers' beliefs, self-reported practices, and needs as they educate language-minority students in the regular classroom are compared and discussed in relation to the literature. The first two sections in this chapter, personal and professional background and current teaching context which provide case history and texture, are analyzed topically. The subsequent sections, beliefs, self-reported instructional practices, and professional development and support, focus directly on the research questions.

Personal and Professional Background

Anita, Joshua and Laura were born in the northeastern part of the United States into blue-collar, middle and upper-middle class families respectively. A generation separates the birth of Anita from Laura and Joshua and the differences in years impact career choices and teacher education

experiences. Unlike Laura and Joshua, Anita was the first person in her family to go to college and she entered higher education through enrollment at a community college in the late 1960's. She chose teaching because at that time career options for women were limited and she enjoyed children. And although she did not specifically say it, a career in teaching for Anita was an upwardly mobile choice.

On the other hand, Laura and Joshua were born a generation later and career options, especially for women, were less limited. With a spectrum of options for women and the declining status of the teaching profession (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986) Laura, unlike Anita, never imagined herself in the classroom. Neither Laura nor Joshua had intentions of becoming teachers; however, both were led into the profession by influential people in their lives.

In addition to career options, the generation that separates Anita from Laura and Joshua shaped their teacher education experiences, despite the fact that since the 1950's teacher education programs have not changed much (Lanier and Little, 1986). None of the teachers majored in education at the undergraduate level. Anita was discouraged from majoring in education because of the oversupply of teachers in the early 1970's. A decade later during Joshua's undergraduate years, the problem of teacher abundance had been replaced by chronic teacher shortages in urban schools. Yet even with the shortage, prospective teachers were encouraged to minor, not major in education. Laura, like Joshua was in undergraduate school during the early 1980's. Although she majored in social policy, her academic department was housed in the school of education because few students were pursuing careers in education at that time. Not one of the three teachers had a course, lecture or required readings on linguistically or culturally diverse students during their

undergraduate or graduate teacher education years, and they all received degrees from institutions that were in or near major urban centers; cities where immigrant populations were on the increase.

All three teachers are currently teaching in public schools; however, Anita began her career as a teacher in a Catholic school. Anita has been in the classroom for 20 years, Joshua for five years and Laura is in her first year. It is essential to consider the teacher informants' ages, social class, and experiences when examining and interpreting the data.

Current Teaching Context

Before analyzing the teaching contexts of Anita, Laura and Joshua, some thoughts about schools are necessary. Since the turn of the century the structure and function of North American public schools has remained largely the same, even as the student population and demands of the larger society have changed. It is a curious phenomenon that one could be blindfolded, led into a school building and know where s/he was. Jackson (1968) documented the predictable mundane life in classrooms. According to Goodlad (1984) although "schools differ; schooling is everywhere much the same" (p. 264). Although recent research suggests that the uniformity of teachers at work is questionable (Little, 1982; Metz, 1978; Zeichner and Tabachnik, 1983; cited in Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986), this observation of the sameness of North American schools is illustrated in the three schools in this study.

First, a few observations will be made about the differences and similarities of the grade levels taught, location and size of the school, and the people that work in, study at, or inhabit the school building. Then an analysis of the teacher informants' teaching contexts will be discussed. It is the goal of this section to provide sufficient background, to paint the backdrop of Anita,

Laura and Joshua's school settings in order to answer the research questions related to beliefs, self-reported practices and professional development needs.

The differences in the schools where Anita, Joshua and Laura teach are characterized by grade level, location and size. Anita teaches fourth grade in a relatively small suburban school. Joshua teaches history and global studies, grades 9 through 12, in a large ethnically diverse urban high school. Finally, Laura teaches fifth grade in an ethnically homogeneous urban elementary school.

In spite of the fact that Anita, Joshua and Laura teach different grades in different schools, there are two similarities in their schools, one of which reflects a broader national trend. Among the similarities are homogeneity of student social class, and staff make-up.

Although race and ethnicity differ in the three schools, they are all comprised of predominantly lower-middle class students. Anita claims that the students in her school, which is 75% white, mostly have parents working at blue-collar jobs. Joshua asserts that the ethnically diverse students in his school are from "middle to lower class families in terms of income and values." And Laura describes her predominantly ethnic Chinese school as having students with working-class parents.

The teaching staff of the three schools corroborates current trends as it is estimated that 90% of teachers nationwide are white (Lanier and Little, 1986). Furthermore, according to Grant and Secada (1990) demographic trends suggest that white females will continue to dominate the profession at least into the next century. In Illinois, for example, 77% of those entering degree-granting teacher training programs in 1987 were women. Of those women completing the degree program, only 10% were non-white (Grant and Secada, 1990). In keeping with current and future trends, both Joshua and Anita's

schools predominantly employ white female teachers and support staff, although Joshua's high school social studies department is mainly white male.

Laura's school deviates somewhat from the national trend with only 65% of the teaching and support staff being white. The remaining 35% of the teaching force is ethnic Chinese. This high percentage of Chinese teachers may be related to the urban location, the availability of teachers, and the homogeneity of the students.

Another reason that Laura's school deviates from the national trends may be due to the belief that minority students should be taught by minority teachers. According to Maldonado-Guzman (1980) the rationale for this belief lies in the expectation that minorities will be more sympathetic to each other, because they understand each other. However, although many minority groups share cultural roots, the differences need to be acknowledged as well. For example, Chinese-American teachers may not have lived the reality of their Chinese students from the mainland.

Research by Ogbu (1992) supports this latter view. Ogbu found that minority members of his research team studying their own culture did not recognize relevant cultural data. Membership in a minority group does not necessarily mean a greater awareness of that particular group.

The research of Maldonado-Guzman (1980), Ogbu (1992) and others, has not been convincing to many. It has been suggested that jobs, and ideological defense of bilingual education are the reasons for the hiring of minorities to teach minorities (Madonado-Guzman, 1980; Porter, 1990).

In understanding their specific teaching contexts, it is striking to note the sameness of Anita, Laura and Joshua's experiences. According to Jackson (1968) the physical environment of schools and social context are noticeably similar in classrooms across the United States. In addition, teachers' roles and

what is expected of them are similar; the only variation has been the increase and intensity of teacher responsibilities. As the student population changes along with the greater society, teachers are expected to fill roles as parents, psychologists, clergy and health professionals. In addition, although to differing degrees, all three teacher informants commented on broad educational themes, such as time constraints, curricular concerns, and school environment and support.

Time Constraints

When discussing their current teaching contexts, all mentioned time as a discordant factor in their day to day lives as teachers. This is consistent with Lortie's (1975) findings that time was "a major source of difficulty in teachers' work" (p. 177). Likewise, Sarason (1982) maintains that time is a source of pressure for teachers. For Anita, the abundance of special programs that pull her students out of class daily severely infringe on her ability to teach to the whole class, provide continuity and employ cooperative strategies.

Laura, like Anita, feels frustrated with time constraints although her students are not pulled out nearly as much as Anita's. Laura frequently feels rushed especially at the end of the day. Her frustration is compounded by the fact that she had higher expectations for herself in her new role as a first year teacher. Her struggles with pacing and classroom management were unanticipated but they are typical problems for beginning teachers as the literature of induction years indicates. New teachers, according to Zumwalt (1986) wrestle with the idea that perfection is an ideal and compromises need to be used as coping mechanisms. Zumwalt suggests that consistency is difficult to achieve as even the simplest of classroom tasks take longer than anticipated.

Joshua's expressed concern about time revolves around the structure of high school classes and the number of students he teaches per day. He sees 160 students per day in 40 minute periods. Actual teaching time is reduced to 30 minutes as he must attend to daily non-instructional tasks of collecting homework, giving homework and taking attendance. These conditions, processing and teaching large numbers of students and balancing classroom instruction with overall school organization within a given time frame, are part of being a high school teacher (Cusik, 1973, cited in Lieberman and Miller, 1984).

Curricular and Content Restrictions

Closely related to teachers' time constraints are curricular or content restrictions. Anita and Joshua spoke of curricular restrictions and Laura spoke of content restrictions although their reasons for feeling restricted vary. Anita, due to the number of packaged curricula and textbooks at her grade level, feels restricted in what she can and cannot teach. This observation is contrary to Goodlad's (1984) findings which report that teachers are "moderately influenced by textbooks and prepackaged material" (p. 186).

Joshua, like Anita feels restricted not only by the structure of his 40 minute class, but by the pressures of the standardized tests that students in his high school must take. He believes that he has no choice in content selection because he is essentially evaluated on whether his students have reached a certain point in the content by a certain time. This lack of choice causes a dilemma for Joshua because at times he sacrifices what his students really need in order to conform to departmental goals. In the words of Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1986)

The difficulties of defining and measuring teaching success combine

> with institutional requirements to encourage the substitution of such goals as covering material and keeping students busy and quiet. (p.517)

On the other hand, Laura feels restricted in content selection, not because of the curricular restraints, but again by the fact that she is a first year teacher. Revising assumptions and commitments is essential for the first year teacher as reality sets in and "coping and struggling become the norm" (Zumwalt, 1986 p. 131). Laura would like to be selecting content and experimenting with instructional practices but she is not ready. Her situation is common given the fact that first year teachers "learn while doing" (Lortie, 1975 p. 60).

School Environment and Support

In describing their current teaching context, school environment and support were unanimously mentioned by the three teacher informants. Anita, Joshua and Laura all mention their principal in relation to their working environment. Moreover, the concept of ambiguity in the principal's role is evident in the case studies and the literature (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1976). Whether the principal's power is truth or myth, "the principalship represents the pivotal exchange point "between teachers, students and the educational policy-making structure" (Sarason, 1982 p. 180).

On the surface, Anita believes that her school is generally a supportive place to work and she credits her own style and personality for the support that she has received. Anita, however, did not articulate specific incidents where she felt supported which suggests that perhaps being left alone is tantamount to having support. Anita reports tension between the teachers, administrators and the community about salary and special programs which raises questions about the nature of actual support. Finally, Anita suspects the

principal of being "political," especially when it comes to the language-minority students.

Joshua relates the school environment to the actions of the principal, yet he acknowledges the complexity of the principal's role. By instilling fear in school personnel, the principal has kept the outside environment, street gangs and crime, from affecting what happens in the school. As a result many teachers are fearful, which causes them to do their job at a minimum so as not to cross the principal. This behavior does not encourage collegiality and, according to Joshua, asking for help or sharing ideas is a sign of weakness or a cause for suspicion. Lortie (1975 cited in Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986) corroborates Joshua's experience.

> A norm against asking for help in any area of serious difficulty prevails because such a request would suggest a failing on the part of the teacher requesting assistance. A complementary norm discourages teachers from telling a peer to do something different. (p. 509)

In addition to conveying weakness, asking for help may be a gender-specific issue. Tannen (1990) suggests that men and women have different conversational styles. Men approach conversations as individuals in a hierarchical social structure. Tannen maintains in a man's world

> conversations are negotiations in which people try to achieve and maintain the upper hand if they can, and protect themselves from others' attempts to put them down and push them around. Life, then, is a contest, a struggle to preserve independence and avoid failure. (p.25)

Laura, feeling different from Anita and Joshua, finds that her colleagues are supportive and the principal helpful. Money she was supposed to receive before the budget cuts to take her students on an overnight trip to an environmental center is a concrete example of support. However, Laura's notion and expectations of school support may be narrow because of the fact that she is a first year teacher. According to Fuller (1969) teachers pass through stages of professional development which influence how they

perceive their work. The first years are characterized mainly by issues of survival and adequacy in the classroom. Laura is currently at that stage and it can be argued that Laura is not ready to focus on the subtleties of the school environment outside of her classroom. In other words, unless the support or lack of support directly affects her classroom, it could go unnoticed.

Up until now the communalities of the teacher informants' teaching contexts have been stressed. However, for Anita, Joshua and Laura, there are three individual themes that must be discussed in order to fully understand their uniqueness. Considering their background, level of experience and current teaching context, the themes of conflict and tension, personal experience and self-reliance and the induction years permeate Anita, Joshua and Laura's experiences as classroom teachers.

Anita: Conflict and Tension

For Anita, the conflict and tension between the teachers, administration and community over school programs is strong. Throughout the interviews, unlike Joshua and Laura, Anita expressed concern about the PTA and its involvement in school programs, the principal and political motives, the parents and their reactions towards the English as a second language (ESL) program, the language-minority students' and the teachers' relationship to one another. This is not to say that conflict and tension does not exist between teachers, parents and the administration in Joshua or Laura's school but the notion of conflict is prominent throughout Anita's case. This tension could be explained in relation to Fuller's (1969) teacher development theory. After 20 years in the classroom, teachers have the experience to focus on broader issues other than those of the classroom. In other words, micro-tasks, competence, security and routine in the classroom make way for teachers to

become involved in macro issues, those that affect the school, community or profession.

However, the conflict and tension, specifically that which concerns the language-minority students and their families in Anita's school, cannot be explained through development theory alone. Anita's community, unlike Joshua and Laura's which are urban, is predominantly white and blue-collar. Although the number of immigrant families is increasing, it is only recently that Anita's community has had to deal with immigrant families and their children in the schools. The issue is compounded as the economic climate worsens. This conflict and tension in the community, in the school and within Anita cannot be ignored in understanding her story.

Joshua: Personal Experience and Self-Reliance

A very different individual theme separates Joshua from Anita and Laura, and is important in understanding Joshua's perspective. Throughout the interviews Joshua consistently referred to his personal schooling experiences which shaped his thoughts about teaching and learning. And although Anita and Laura draw on personal experience from time to time, the frequency and explicit nature did not compare to that of Joshua. Personal experience for Joshua contributed to his entering the profession, and currently drives the way he relates to his students and teaches his class.

Joshua's feelings of personal experience and self-reliance can be found in the literature. For example, Lortie (1975) described socialization into teaching as "' self-socialization': one's personal predispositions are not only relevant, but in fact, stand in the core of becoming a teacher" (p.79). Greene (1986) focuses on the importance of "our life stories in thinking about our craft" (p.16). She suggests that personal experience and reflection allow us to

remember our first days of school and what it was like to be the learner. According to Greene (1986), "neglecting to think about our past, we are often likely to repeat behaviors recalled from the past" (p.17).

While the importance of past experiences on the present is essential (Lortie, 1975; Greene, 1986), Joshua's emphasis on the personal may be extreme since he feels that there is not much new that he needs to learn in working with language-minority students. Recalling one's experiences as the sole factor in becoming a better teacher may not be enough. Reflection, dialogue, sharing and gaining new information is essential especially since many of the issues connected with the education of language-minority students calls for specialized knowledge that is not included in preservice teacher teacher education programs.

Perhaps for Joshua his reliance on self may be a coping mechanism which masks his anxieties in working with language-minority students. Anxiety, according to Jersild (1955) "may arise as a reaction to anything that threatens one's existence as a separate self or that jeopardizes the attitude one has concerning oneself" (p.27). Based on theories of Horney (1950) individuals may develop strategies to deal with anxiety. One of Horney's strategies that Joshua appears to employ is that of remaining detached and aloof. Joshua appears to remain emotionally and cognitively uninvolved as he rejects the notion that there are aspects of working with language-minority students that that he needs to learn.

Laura: The Induction Year

Laura's individual theme is that of the first year teacher, the induction year. As mentioned previously, first year teachers are focused on self, on survival and adequacy in the classroom. According to Kagan (1992) first year

teachers seek to: (a) gain knowledge of students; (b) use that knowledge to adapt and redefine their image as a teacher; (c) develop procedures and routines that facilitate classroom management and teaching. Laura decided only a year ago that she wanted to be in the classroom; her teacher preparation was a year long. She is surely learning by doing (Lortie, 1975) and this individual theme must be considered in order to understand Laura's story.

Summary

The teaching contexts of Anita, Laura and Joshua reflect elements of public classrooms and schools across the United States. The similarities are striking given the location, grade levels and individual teachers. Broad topics, such as time constraints, curricular decisions and school environment and support are the strokes that paint not only the background of the three teacher informants, but America's educational picture. Just as the similarities reflect broader educational issues, the differences illuminate the three teacher informants as individuals. Conflict and tension, self-reliance and personal experience and the induction year are the individual themes that emerged from Anita, Joshua and Laura's cases. They are essential to understanding their stories.

Beliefs

There is a plethora of process-product research that has provided educators and researchers with valuable information into the relationships between teachers' and students' classroom behavior and student achievement (Clark and Peterson, 1986). However, studying observable teacher behavior is only part of understanding what makes the teaching process uniquely human

(National Institute of Education, 1975; Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986). An additional part is exploring the beliefs that shape, contribute or influence teacher behavior. Assuming, at minimum, that the relationship between teacher beliefs and teacher behavior is multidirectional (Richardson, Anders, Tidwell and Lloyd, 1991), it is essential for educators to continue exploring and describing the mental lives of teachers. According to Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1986) teachers are largely "untapped resources" (p. 505). Their beliefs and actions inform their practice and contribute insights into the development of the profession. Hence, Anita, Joshua and Laura's beliefs are explored in the following subsections: (a) language-minority students; (b) programmatic approach; (c) lexical choice; (d) and individual themes.

Language-Minority Students

The following topics are presented in describing and comparing the teacher informants' language-minority students. They are: (a) knowledge of language-minority students; (b) beliefs about academic and social success; (c) beliefs about culture; (d) language-minority students' relations with peers; (e) and teacher efficacy.

For the purposes of this study, language-minority students in Anita and Laura's classes are defined as those students who are pulled out of the regular classroom for ESL class. Language-minority students in Joshua's classes are those students who previously attended ESL or bilingual classes, but are currently in mainstream classes.

Knowledge of language-minority students.

An examination of Anita, Laura and Joshua's cases reveals that none of the teachers really know much about their language-minority students, except for speculation of national origin and native language of the students, their

parents or guardians. At most, Anita, Laura and Joshua have a shallow understanding of the nature of their language-minority students' first language (L1), first language background, socioeconomic background, education and literacy of parents or guardians and culture. None of the teacher informants mentioned anything about their students' national origin in terms of rural or urban, political and historical background, acculturation patterns, previous schooling and resident status. This is important as instructional and curricular decisions should be made on the basis of students' needs. More than a superficial understanding is required in order to effectively teach language-minority students. (Scarcella, 1990).

Anita's two language-minority students, out of a class of 23, are native Spanish speakers: Luz is from Central America and Rosa is from the Caribbean. Anita is not sure about the circumstances under which her language-minority students came to the United States. Laura's four language-minority students, out of 28, are ethnic Chinese. However, she is not sure if they are from China or the United States. She believes that their native language (L1) is Chinese, yet she does not know if they speak Mandarin, Cantonese or another dialect. Finally, Joshua estimates that over half of his 160 students are language-minority. Therefore, he can only be sure about the native language (L1) and national origin of the few students that separate themselves from the rest either by being extremely bright or behaving inappropriately. At best, Anita and Laura have a sketchy knowledge of their language-minority students' home life and their parents' or guardians' employment. Joshua, due in part to the numbers of language-minority students, rarely mentioned specifics about his language-minority students' home life or about their parents or guardians.

Beliefs about academic and social success.

All three teacher informants hold tacit and conscious beliefs and expectations about their language-minority students. These beliefs and expectations may affect teacher behavior and influence academic achievement (Rosenthal and Jacobson, 1968; Rist, 1970; Brophy and Good, 1986, Good and Weinstein, 1986). Beliefs and expectations about language-minority students are shaped by a number of factors including culture and ethnicity, language behavior and linguistic variation of the students', and teachers' attitudes towards language (Bikson, 1974; Harber, 1979; Maldonado-Guzman, 1980; Cazden, 1986a).

Anita is much more expressive about her beliefs towards her language-minority students perhaps because she has been teaching the longest and because of her context. Her suburban school district is more homogeneous than that of Joshua and Laura and the recent arrival of immigrant students has caused her, her school and the greater community to deal with issues that teachers, schools and communities in urban settings have been dealing with for a long time.

Both Anita and Laura believe that there are additional factors, other than language that influence academic progress. But they do not mention external factors such as social, cultural or political structures which may also contribute to or inhibit academic progress. For example, Anita's beliefs about Luz have changed over the years. Initially, Anita believed that Luz would be" a success story" because of her performance in kindergarten. Currently, Anita suspects that Luz "has a little less intelligence, motor coordination difficulties or other problems." It is not surprising that Anita's beliefs and expectations have changed over the years towards Luz as Anita's initial criterion for Luz's success was her ability to follow and adapt, skills that might

be useful in kindergarten, but are not sufficient to excel in fourth grade. Fourth graders must read to learn, reason, infer, write and problem-solve. It is conceivable that Luz's ability to adapt in kindergarten did not equip her to progress through the increasing demands of grades one through four, and as Luz fell behind, her teachers may have expected less of her, thus, treating her differently. This would corroborate the numerous research studies linking teachers' differential treatment to student achievement (Rosenthal and Jacobson, 1968; Rist, 1970; Bikson, 1974; Harber, 1979; Maldonado-Guzman, 1980; Brophy and Good, 1986; Cazden, 1986a; Good and Weinstein, 1986; Richards, 1990). Luz is currently in Anita's lowest reading group, reading two grades below level.

In addition to the fact that Anita's beliefs about Luz's academic success have changed over the years, her beliefs about Luz's character have also changed. As mentioned previously, based upon her performance in kindergarten, Anita felt that Luz would succeed academically and socially. Now, not only have Anita's academic expectations for Luz changed, but her beliefs about her integrity have changed. For example, there is inconsistency between Luz's performance in her reading group and the results of the IOWA test. Anita concludes that cheating is the reason that Luz scored as high as she did on the IOWA test. It is possible that Luz could do poorly on reading group tasks, such as discrete phonics exercises and clozes, and do better in answering general comprehension questions from short readings (Diaz, Moll and Mehan, 1986) that are part of the IOWA test. This possibility is suggested by Becker (1977 cited in Cummins, 1979) who distinguished "vocabulary-concept knowledge," a student's grasp of the underlying meanings of words, as fundamental to reading comprehension over decoding skills (p. 237). The

point here is Anita's conclusions about Luz's character may be unwarranted since she neglects to consider educational or pedagogical causes.

Anita believes, on the other hand, that Rosa will succeed academically and "she will be able to do whatever it is she attempts." Although she is two years ahead of Luz academically, she is still in the lowest reading group. Nevertheless, Anita does not give Rosa a chance in the next higher reading group which suggests Anita's lack of confidence in Rosa. Leaving Rosa in the lowest reading group may be detrimental, as students tend to conform to the academic norms of the group (Rist, 1970).

Finally, Anita believes that Rosa is at an academic disadvantage because her native language, Spanish, rather then English, is spoken at home. Anita's beliefs about home language reflect the erroneous assumption behind the "insufficient exposure hypothesis" which attributes lack of English language progress and school failure to inadequate exposure to English. Although intuitively appealing, this hypothesis lacks research support. In fact, numerous studies report the contrary, that language-minority students, over time do **not** lose out in the development of English language academic skills despite spending less time instructed in English than comparable students instructed solely through English (Hakuta, 1986, Cummins, 1989). Exposure to English is not sufficient for acquisition. Krashen claims that comprehensible input, the ability to understand messages using linguistic and extralinguistic cues, is the key to second language acquisition (Krashen, 1985).

Anita's beliefs about home language may have serious implications for her language-minority students' language development. Specifically, her belief that lack of English in the home causes slower overall English language development is not supported by the research. In fact, the research suggests that peers play a greater role than parents and teachers, as language models

for second language learners. In other words, given a choice, L2 speakers choose to emulate peer speech over parents (Dulay, Burt and Krashen, 1982; Beebe, 1985).

Moreover, Anita's home language beliefs may result in well intentioned recommendations that Rosa's parents try to speak more English at home. Adherence to these recommendations may have detrimental outcomes. Depending on the English language ability of the parents (Saville-Troike, 1989), Rosa could be exposed to poor models of English. Perhaps more serious is the quality and quantity of family communication may suffer (Wong-Fillmore, 1991; Wong-Fillmore and Meyer, 1992). Finally, if parents feel that communication in the native language (L1) represents warmth and affection, strained family relations may occur as the amount of interaction is reduced and the quality of it is changed. Parent-child interaction and academic achievement has been well-documented (Well, 1986 cited in Cummins, 1989).

Laura, like Anita, believes that language is just one internal factor among many that influences her language-minority students' social and academic progress. Laura's beliefs may stem from the fact that her language-minority students are pulled out for resource room, Title I reading and speech. The message sent to Laura, before she even became acquainted with her language-minority students is one of academic and social difficulty which may have led her to unconsciously lower expectations for these students. Moreover, there is at least one overt example where Laura lowers her expectations for a language-minority student. For example, because Ting-Ting is out of the room for special programs, she frequently does not understand the homework assignments. As a result, Laura admits that she often gives Ting Ting less demanding assignments. Therefore, as the school year progresses, Ting Ting may fall farther behind since less is demanded from her.

Joshua shares few insights into what he believes about his language-minority students' abilities; however, he makes one generalization when they first enter his classes. He expects that they cannot read or write in English and he questions their ability to comprehend. He perceives himself to be strict, expecting the same quality of work from all his students regardless of their academic or linguistic abilities. This may be related to his belief that academic success is in the hands of the individual student. Joshua believes that hard work and determination are the most important characteristics for language-minority student success. This belief may stem from his personal experiences in school which were initially unsuccessful. He himself admits that he did not work very hard during his school years, yet when he applied himself, he succeeded, suggesting the importance of individual effort.

Individual effort, although important, may not be enough to assure success for language-minority students. The fact that Joshua is a white male may contribute to his faith in individual power. Joshua's belief that hard work and determination are essential for student success, overlooks at minimum, the social, cultural and political context within which language-minority students exist.

Beliefs about culture.

As previously mentioned, all three teacher informants hold beliefs and expectations of their language-minority students' academic abilities. These beliefs and expectations may be shaped by both the micro and macro context, and conscious and unconscious views of culture and ethnicity. According to Maldonado-Guzman (1980), beliefs about culture, which may result in differential treatment, stem from one or any combination of "ethnocentrism, orthodoxy, motive or intent, attraction and/or philosophy and ideology" (p.2).

Anita, Joshua and Laura all hold beliefs about their language-minority students' cultural background. In some instances they rely on hearsay, and in other instances they form beliefs by observation. Beliefs formed by observation may be questionable due to the subjective lens that is used in the interpretation of observations. Upon deeper reflection, Joshua and Laura admit that the source of their cultural beliefs is unknown and partially due to stereotypes.

Specifically, Anita believes that culture is the reason that Luz does not "open up and talk" because Latino children are not supposed to cause problems for their families. In addition, Anita believes that Latino girls mature physically faster than other children. Whether these beliefs are hearsay or direct observation, Anita may be using Maldonado-Guzman's (1980) "orthodoxy and ethnocentrism" as the lens that interprets Luz's behavior. Unfortunately, beliefs that are rooted in ethnocentrism and orthodoxy are at a minimum incomplete and frequently false.

Joshua believes that many of his Asian language-minority students are taught to be "humble and quiet" and this prevents them from speaking up in class. Likewise, Laura believes that Asian parents are "passive". From a historical context, Tang (personal communication, July 8, 1992) elaborates on the "notion of passiveness" in Asian students. Asians, particularly Chinese, are taught to respect teacher authority, to be polite and quiet. Knowledge should not be demonstrated in front of the group.

However, Tang maintains that Asian students are perceived as passive only when passive is defined as non-verbal, nonaggressive or inactive. According to Tang, many Asian students are anything but passive; they are active listeners. Many Asian students strive for perfection; therefore, do not participate in class until they are entirely sure they are correct. With many

Asian students excelling academically and many Asian businesses thriving, perhaps the definition of passive needs to be broadened.

Language-minority students' relations with peers.

Language-minority students' relations with their peers is another topic that was discussed in attempting to understand the three teacher informants' beliefs about language-minority students in the mainstream classroom. Anita's responses appear contradictory as she flips from how much the other students befriend Luz and Rosa, to what a nice school she works, to the reactions of individual students. The reactions of individual students seem to be shaped by their parents' opinion and the community prejudice towards language-minority students. Anita's contradictions mirror the tension between the classroom, the school and the community. Anita may be struggling with her own tacit feelings and prejudices towards her language-minority students.

Joshua and Laura's urban settings contribute to the fact that they feel that their language-minority students are generally accepted by the other students. However, this feeling may be superficial since there appears to be a stigma attached to participating in an ESL or bilingual program. This topic is discussed later in this chapter.

According to Joshua, his school has always been ethnically and culturally diverse; therefore, the students are generally accepting of language-minority students because they are accustomed to being together. Interestingly, Joshua is the only teacher informant that mentioned the role of the teacher as a factor in student acceptance. This implies that just because students attend the same school, they accept each other.

Laura's school is 95% ethnic Chinese which suggests that a majority of the students in the school may be language-minority, although not according

to the definition used in this study. As previously defined, language-minority students, for the purpose of this study, are those students who are pulled out for ESL classes. In Laura's class, the four language-minority students are often seen communicating with their peers in the native language; therefore, communication does not appear to be problematic. However, since Laura does not speak Chinese, she does not know the content or tone of the communication.

Teacher efficacy.

Personal efficacy, the belief in one's competence as a teacher (Ashton and Webb, 1986) influences student achievement (Brophy and Everston, 1976; Gibson and Dembo, 1884; Ashton and Webb, 1986). Anita's doubts manifest themselves in her desires to do more for Rosa, yet she does not "know where to begin to start to help her." Anita also maintains inadequacies in her ability to assess her language-minority students' needs and she feels less capable when her language-minority students are beginners in English.

On the other hand, Anita's doubts seem minimal as she expresses her knowledge about language-minority students like a laundry list. For example she refers to studies in a broad sense, although she does not cite specific research, that show the importance of native language development. She talks about stages of language development, and the importance of incorporating culture into lessons with language-minority students. However, when it comes to applying her knowledge, there is evidence that Anita lacks sufficient depth in order to apply what she knows about the education of language-minority students. For example, during Latin class, there is ample opportunity for Luz and Rosa to excel because of the Latin influence on the Spanish language.

Anita could exploit the importance of Luz and Rosa's native language; however, during the classroom observations she did not.

In contrast, Joshua appears to have a relatively high sense of efficacy, although he does mention that he would not mind knowing what methods have proven to be effective in working with language-minority students. He believes that there is not much that he needs to learn. Not only does he believe that there is little or no new content that he needs, he believes that only experienced classroom teachers might have something to offer. This implies that Joshua may not be open to learning about second language development from a researcher or expert in the field. Joshua's sense of efficacy stems from his belief that there are generic processes that bind all teachers together regardless of subject matter. He believes that "good teaching is good teaching."

As discussed previously, Joshua's withdrawal or inability to accept that there are aspects of second language development that he could learn from experts or colleagues may be related to the concept of detachment (Horney 1950). Detachment, used to mask anxiety, is characterized by withdrawal and denial. The statement that "good teaching is good teaching" is superficial in that it denies the existence of specialized knowledge.

Moreover, resistance, like detachment, may be another strategy that Joshua employs to mask anxiety. Resistance, according to Horney (1950) is an important phenomena in understanding learning. Resistance may manifest in a failure to notice, hear, remember or understand something. Curran (1972) claims that in adult learning there is resistance to new knowledge because of the adult's need for self-assertion. Adult resistance, according to Curran, is subconscious and may manifest itself in denial of the importance of new knowledge. Perhaps anxious that he may discover that he is not as effective

with language-minority students as he thinks he is, Joshua appears to remain closed to new information about teaching these students.

Unlike Joshua, Laura, as a beginning teacher, feels much more overwhelmed and inadequate in her ability to deal with language-minority students; her sense of personal efficacy is low. There is no sense of confidence when Laura describes her language-minority students. She feels incompetent and unprepared. In fact, she raises many more questions than Anita and Joshua about language development, problems that may influence language development, and language-minority student assessment. As a first year teacher she does not seem afraid to admit her inadequacies.

Programmatic Approach

The above topics serve to compare and contrast the teacher informants' beliefs about their language-minority students. What follows is an exploration of the teacher informants' understanding of programmatic approaches for these students. First, a brief description and comparison of the programs in Anita, Joshua and Laura's schools is presented. (For a detailed description of programmatic approaches see Chapter IV the individual case histories). It should be kept in mind that the descriptions and to some extent the comparisons are based on the teacher informants' perceptions of the existing programs; therefore, program descriptions and details could be inaccurate. What follows is a discussion of topics, which include: (a) teacher informants' understanding of the programs for language-minority students; (b) communication with the ESL and bilingual staff; (c) and the stigma attached to being a student in an ESL or bilingual program follow.

Descriptions of programmatic approaches.

According to Anita her school has an ESL pull-out program for grades one through six where one ESL teacher travels between two school buildings in the district. Language-minority students in the pull-out program are placed according to chronological age, not English language ability. The language-minority students in kindergarten participate in an extended day program.

In Joshua's school, there is more than one option for language-minority students. Those students who arrive with limited English skills are placed immediately into a content-based ESL program and they are mainstreamed into regular classes when they pass the ESL exit exam. In addition to the content-based ESL program, there are Spanish bilingual classes, although the school boasts large numbers of students who speak Chinese and Korean. Staffing seems to be the overt reason why there are no bilingual classes in other major languages which reflects the bilingual teacher shortages as reported by the U.S. Congressional Record (1989).

Finally, Laura's school has a bilingual and ESL pull-out program. The bilingual program, called a "bridge" in her school, but commonly referred to in the literature as a transitional bilingual program, is unlike the bilingual program in Joshua's school in that it is for newly arrived immigrant students. According to Laura, the bridge classes ease the transition into the ESL pull-out program and mainstream classes. The ESL pull-out program is similar to that of Anita's school in terms of scheduling.

Evidently, all three schools have programs for their language-minority population in spite of the fact that a little less than half of all language-minority students across the United States are receiving special language services (O'Malley, 1982). And while the programmatic approaches differ

somewhat between extended day and pull-out ESL in Anita's school, to content-based ESL and Spanish bilingual in Joshua's school, to Chinese bilingual and pull-out ESL in Laura's school, it is predictable that they all assume McKay's (1988) assimilationist model. And while not explicitly stated and frequently hidden by excuses of staffing and resource problems, the programmatic goals are for students to learn English as quickly as possible at the potential expense of native language development. Proponents of the assimilationist model assume that learning English in order to enter the mainstream takes priority over becoming a balanced bilingual and that the two are mutually exclusive. In other words, language-minority students either learn English quickly through a transitional bilingual or ESL program at the expense of their native language, or develop their native language in a maintenance or dual language program at the expense of learning English. This assumption is contrary to the growing body of research that suggests that development of the first language supports the development of the second language (Swain and Lapkin, 1982; Hakuta, 1986; Genesee, Tucker and Lambert, 1987; Cummins, 1989). The assimilationist model that Anita, Joshua and Laura's schools employ confirms national trends, as the majority of programs for language-minority students are submersion or some form of ESL.

Understanding of programmatic approaches.

In describing their schools' programmatic approaches for language-minority students, the three teacher informants were able to superficially describe the programs but admitted ignorance to anything more than program scheduling and placement. In fact, all three repeatedly confessed that they really did not know what goes on in the ESL and bilingual classrooms. This lack of understanding is not surprising. Penfield (1987) has documented

mainstream teachers' unfamiliarity with the role of the ESL teacher. This lack of awareness of ESL programs may be caused by the isolation of teachers and time constraints that has been described in the broader educational literature (Jackson, 1968; Lortie, 1975, Sarason, 1982; Lieberman and Miller, 1984; Goodlad, 1984). It is not surprising that Anita, Joshua and Laura are not cognizant of what happens in other classes, yet it is disturbing because what happens in the bilingual/ESL pull-out classes influences the language-minority students in their classes.

Anita, Joshua and Laura's lack of understanding of what goes on in the ESL and bilingual classes appears to be linked to the teacher informants' individual themes: conflict and tension; self-reliance and individualism; and the induction year. For example, Anita's unfamiliarity with programmatic approaches is tempered by the conflict and tension that is within herself, the school and the greater community. She is the only teacher that reported community members dissatisfaction with the ESL program and the heated discussions that have subsequently occurred at school board meetings. Anita may want to know more about what goes on in the ESL classes, but community dissatisfaction, pressure and inner conflict may prevent her from showing interest even if she had the time.

Joshua's reliance on personal experience and his high sense of efficacy suggests that the reason that he is unaware of what occurs in the content-based ESL classes is he may not think that it is important. Finally, the induction year, for Laura, explains at least in part why she is unfamiliar with what transpires in the ESL and bilingual classes. As previously stated, new teachers are preoccupied with survival and it is a rare first year teacher that has the mental space and physical time to know what is going on in other classes.

For common reasons such as time constraints and isolation and individual reasons such as conflict, self-sufficiency and the induction year, Anita and Joshua do not appear disturbed in their lack of understanding of what happens in the ESL or bilingual classes. Perhaps this is because they are more experienced teachers who have realistic expectations about their roles, and what they need to know. On the other hand, Laura feels that she "should know." Laura's feelings may be related to role definition as she struggles in her first year of teaching to know what she needs to know and what is expected of her.

It is interesting to note that even with acknowledged unfamiliarity, all three teacher informants have opinions as to the effectiveness of their schools' programmatic approach. Their opinions, therefore, are based on hearsay; a lack of first hand information. For example, Anita finds it hard to believe that language-minority students can learn anything in a 45 minute pull-out period, especially when the students are grouped by chronological age instead of by English language ability. Joshua, in accordance with his emphasis on self-sufficiency, believes that it is not the program which is effective or ineffective, but the individual student who will succeed or fail. Finally, Laura doubts the effectiveness of her school's ESL pull-out and bilingual program partially because of what other teachers have said and partially because she has not seen English language improvement among her language-minority students thus far.

In terms of the ideal programmatic approach for language-minority students, Anita holds the strongest opinions. Her "no" approach, or submersion for language-minority students who enter school in the early elementary grades, or a bilingual approach, for language-minority students who are proficient in their first language and enter school in the upper

elementary grades, is based on her opinion that students should be treated as individuals and not just lumped into special classes. Joshua is ambivalent as to which approach is the most effective for language-minority students because of his beliefs in the individual language-minority student. Once again, the notion of self-sufficiency arises for Joshua; however, it manifests itself in the student's role. Finally, Laura, consistent with the insecurity of being a first year teacher, admits that she does not know enough about programs for language-minority students to base an opinion.

Communication with the ESL and bilingual staff.

Communication with the ESL and bilingual staff is related to the teacher informants' understanding of programs for language-minority students because communication problems are closely related to teacher isolation (Lortie, 1975; Sarason, 1982; Lieberman and Miller, 1984; Goodlad, 1984). More specifically it affirms Penfield's (1987) findings of the absence of communication between ESL and mainstream teachers. For example, dialogue between Anita and the ESL teacher is often through memos which frequently consist of a level of dialogue containing yes/no questions and responses, and imperatives. For Joshua and Laura, there is no communication.

Both Anita and Laura feel that leadership from the administration might solve the communication problems between the ESL, bilingual and mainstream teachers, but their approaches differ. For Anita, this leadership should be in the form of mandatory meetings. Laura's approach is less authoritative or naive as she suggests optional lunch meetings for ESL, bilingual and mainstream teachers to discuss issues.

Stigma associated with being a student in an ESL or bilingual program.

The final topic of this section is the stigma attached to being a language-minority student in a bilingual or ESL program. It is not surprising as the debate on bilingualism is centered around power, politics and ethnicity as opposed to instructional value for students (Hakuta, 1986). Bilingualism or language use represents social, political and economic status and the relationship between majority and minority groups is important (Ogbu, 1992). For example, Spanish may elicit an image of welfare and poverty, in the eyes of the less informed and ignorant.

Two main advocacy groups, U.S. English and English Plus, represent polar views in the current language debate. U.S. English, a citizens group that supports a constitutional English language amendment, maintains that the English language is threatened by a shift towards bilingualism. S.I. Hayakawa, the honorary chairman of U.S. English, warns that one official language is the only way for the United States to unite as a nation (Hayakawa, 1992). Opposing U.S. English is English Plus. Comprised of over 50 civil rights and educational organizations, English Plus promotes English language proficiency plus proficiency in a second or more languages (English Plus Information Clearinghouse, 1992).

Regardless of political alignment, schools receive society's mixed messages about language, politics and bilingualism. These messages are consciously or unconsciously translated into attitudes towards language-minority students. And as previously discussed, attitudes toward minority language use and variation conjure images and influence behavior (Bikson, 1974; Harber, 1974; Cazden, 1989).

In addition, Ogbu (1978, 1992) has documented the interactions of power and status between majority and minority groups and the influence on

academic achievement. Ogbu claims there is a vast variability of academic progress among language-minority groups due to status, power, and relation to English.

Anita, Joshua and Laura's belief that their language-minority students are happier in the regular classroom may be because of the stigma. This ethnocentric belief is based on subjective interpretation. Anita spoke of her language-minority students as wanting to be like the other kids. Joshua mentioned that even as some of his language-minority struggled in his class they did not want to go back to ESL. Lastly, Laura, although less aware of the politics in her school, commented how the principal wanted to encourage positive interaction between the language-minority students and the regular students because of the stigma attached to being in the bilingual or ESL classes.

Individual Themes

While the above topics highlight communalities of the teacher informants' experiences, their individual themes, which include conflict and conformity, self-reliance and individualism, and the induction year, serve to emphasize their uniqueness.

Anita: conflict and conformity.

As discussed thus far, what makes Anita's story unique is the personal, institutional and societal conflict that permeates her story. Her comments, her tone and her beliefs reflect the many faces of the national debate of schooling for linguistically and culturally diverse students. In addition to the conflict, conformity appears to be related to Maldonado-Guzman's (1980) "ethnocentrism and orthodoxy." For example, Anita makes numerous distinctions between language-minority students and the other students with her choice of pronouns, possessive pronouns and possessive adjectives. The language-

minority students and their families are referred to as "they" "them" and "their" and the other students and their families are referred to as "we" "us "and "our." This choice of language suggests a division between the two groups and according to Anita, it is the role of the language-minority students and their families to fit in and conform, yet there is a sense that "they" will not ever really be like "us."

Joshua: self-reliance and individualism.

Joshua is defined by self-reliance and individualism. This theme is manifested in the emphasis that he places on his role and that of his students. He believes that he sets the pace and instructional climate, but academic and social success is ultimately in the hands of the individual student.

Acknowledging the importance of individual factors, Joshua nevertheless neglects to consider external factors, which influence language-minority student success. Schumann's acculturation model (1978a; 1978b) suggests that second language development is closely related to cultural adaptability. Schumann posits that acculturation and second language development is determined by the degree of social and psychological distance between members of a second language learning group (2LL group) and members of a target language group (TL group). Schumann posits that "the greater the social distance between the two groups the more difficult it is for the members of the 2LL group to acquire the language of the TL group" (Schumann, 1978b p. 261). According to Schumann (1978b) the following issues are involved in social distance and can facilitate or inhibit second language development. They are:

> (a) In relation to the TL group is the 2LL group politically, culturally, technically or economically dominant, non-dominant or subordinate? (b) Is the integration pattern of the 2LL group assimilation, acculturation of preservation? (c) What is the 2LL group's degree of

> enclosure? (d) Is the 2LL group cohesive? (e) What is the size of the 2LL group? (f) Are the cultures of the two groups congruent? (g) What are the attitudes of the two groups toward each other? (h) What is the 2LL groups intended length of residence in the target language area? (p. 261)

Not all of the above issues need to be reconciled in order for acculturation and second language acquisition to occur. These issues serve as a gauge.

Whereas Joshua acknowledges that psychological distance is a result of individual and affective factors, he does not seem to understand that social distance comprises factors that affect the learner. Neglecting to consider social factors reflects a narrow and naive view of the social and political structures that influence individual behavior. Perhaps, for Joshua, placing the responsibility on the individual language-minority student is a coping mechanism; a way to lift the burden of the enormous responsibility of educating approximately 160 kids per day.

Laura: the induction year.

Finally, Laura's individual theme, once again, is the induction year. Her reliance on textbooks, questions about students' language abilities and lack of awareness of programmatic approaches may be partially if not totally attributed to her inexperience as a classroom teacher. This is not to say that experience alone will transform her into an expert teacher who is competent in working with language-minority students. Experience will free her from the day to day survival strategies and allow her to reflect on issues of greater importance such as language-minority students, or be more creative in her classroom decisions.

Lexical Choice

Before concluding this section, lexical choice must be addressed in order to synthesize Anita, Joshua and Laura's beliefs towards language-minority

students in the mainstream classroom. Thoughts and beliefs are housed in language; therefore, tacit beliefs may become conscious through looking at lexical choice. The following comments are not the result of a quantitative content analysis; they are more of an interpretation, a texture that is felt when reading the cases.

It appears that Anita's choice of words is frequently negative when she speaks about language-minority students, their programs and their language. For example, she uses words such as, "suspicious," "revert," "suspect," "cheat," "secretive," "culturally deprived," "no language skills," "re-educate," "deficit" and "remedial," which all carry negative images. This is not to say that Joshua and Laura's language is necessarily more positive; however, in Laura's case, for example, she is the only teacher informant that speaks to her students about the positive aspects of being bilingual. Furthermore, she shows empathy as she relates her own experiences in trying to learn bits of Chinese. Finally, there are more examples of positive language, such as "positive interaction", "good receptive skills" and a "nice kid." Choice of words, then, may be the window to subconscious feelings.

Summary

What are the teacher informants' beliefs about language-minority students in the regular classroom? It is difficult to reach a definitive answer to a question that deals with a tacit concept such as beliefs. Despite the fact that statements may be listened to and analyzed, beliefs can not be observed. Furthermore, combinations of beliefs may cause different behaviors (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986). Nevertheless, the study of beliefs is an important step in understanding the mental lives of teachers (Elbaz, 1981).

All teachers, including Anita, Joshua and Laura, have beliefs which partly stem from individual experience. Moreover, teachers are products of the greater society, and what happens in the classroom is to some extent a reflection of society. It appears that many of the teacher informants' beliefs are based on hearsay and misinformation. All three have minimal understanding of their language-minority students' background and programs, yet they have a multitude of opinions which suggests the power of collective societal beliefs. To some extent all three teacher informants believe that academic or social difficulties are caused solely by internal factors within the language-minority student. This is not to say that internal factors are not important; however, neglecting to acknowledge external factors such as societal attitudes, political structures, and acculturation patterns implies a blaming-the-victim attitude. Internal factors, specifically language alone, cannot account for the disproportionate number of students of color that experience academic failure (Cummins, 1989).

More specifically, Anita's beliefs appear to be the strongest as she doubts Luz's academic abilities and neglects to take an academic chance with Rosa. Her mistrust of the ESL program and staff, and the language she uses to describe the language-minority students conform to the negative beliefs of some community members. Her changing beliefs towards Luz may be related to Luz's academic performance alone, but it may also be due to the changing climate of this country. As the economy worsens in these conservative times, there may be less tolerance and acceptance for those who are linguistically or culturally different.

Joshua's beliefs appear to be less affected by society at large as he is less involved in politics of his school and community. It is clear that Joshua believes in the strength of the individual language-minority student as the

distinguishing factor for academic success, which implies that he believes the contrary, weak language-minority students will fail. Believing that success or failure lies within the language-minority student corroborates Cummins' (1989) view that the focus of academic failure in language-minority students has always resulted in the conclusion that the problem lies within the student, as opposed to problems related to the school context. Clearly, as Schumann (1978a, 1978b) posits in his acculturation theory, there is a balance between psychological and social factors that contribute to the success or failure of language-minority students.

Laura believes that bilingualism is a positive attribute; however, she is struggling to survive as a first year teacher, and the magnitude cannot be underestimated. Her conscious beliefs may manifest themselves through questions. Laura had the most questions and overt doubts which may suggest that she is open and malleable.

Acknowledging that beliefs play a part in shaping behavior is fundamental to professional development. Anita, Joshua and Laura are faced with enormous daily responsibility as classroom teachers. Yet the mere fact that they volunteered to participate in this study shows a willingness, at minimum, to engage in dialogue about language-minority students and the issues that surround these students.

Self-Reported Instructional Practices

The purpose of this section is to explore the self-reported instructional practices that the three teacher informants employ with their language-minority students and the rationale behind those practices. This exploration is essential for three reasons. First, through individual and collective experience, teachers have a wealth of wisdom that may serve to inform others

in the profession. Second, understanding the rationale behind the selection of instructional practices may reveal clues at to what beliefs these teachers hold about their language-minority students (Underhill, 1988). Finally, information on self-reported instructional practices, although not necessarily effective, will help staff developers build upon the experiences of mainstream teachers, instead of presenting practices that may be unrealistic given their teaching context. Understanding the perspective of mainstream teachers is critical, since "experts" and "novices" in a given domain, view problems, tasks and issues differently (Chi, Glaser and Rees, 1981).

This section begins with a comparison of the teacher informants' self-reports of instructional practices that they employ in their classrooms. Two topics follow: teacher efficacy and notions of language proficiency. This section concludes with a summary for the purpose of answering the second research question regarding self-reported instructional practices the mainstream teachers use with their language-minority students.

In comparing the self-reported instructional practices of the three teacher informants, there are three similarities. First, although their reasons differ, Anita, Joshua, and Laura do not plan their lessons differently or vary content because of the presence of language-minority students in their classes. Anita blames lack of planning and content variation on the packaged curricula that are required, and the scheduling that makes her class resemble a bus depot.

Joshua, on the other hand, has been implicitly informed that language-minority students who have been mainstreamed into his classes should be prepared; therefore, additional planning and content selection is not necessary. In addition, he acknowledges the fact that there are other students in his classes, and he believes that language-minority students must keep up

with the class as opposed to the class being held back by the language-minority students.

Laura's planning process is characterized by thinking about her students as a whole instead of considering individual differences. Consistent with the literature on the induction year, Laura's first year of teaching is characterized by a focus on self and survival (Fuller, 1969; Zumwalt, 1986; Kagan, 1992); therefore, her planning behavior is not surprising. However, individual differences, as related to second language development, must be considered. While there is disagreement as to the influence and role of individual differences in the process of second language development, available evidence suggests that factors such as age, aptitude, motivation, cognitive style, personality, and learning strategies, account for differences in learner success (Littlewood, 1984; Ellis, 1986; Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991). Despite the fact that there are many more questions than answers in the literature regarding the relationship of individual differences to second language development, Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) suggest the importance for teachers to understand the individual characteristics of their students in order to meet their learning needs. In addition to approaching her students as a whole group, Laura relies on textbooks, which may be more a result of being a first year teacher than having language-minority students in her class.

Secondly, while the teacher informants do not change their planning or content selection, implementation of their lessons is frequently altered because of their language-minority students. Anita reports that she incorporates more culture and tries to use student experiences in the reading group that has language-minority students. It is interesting that Anita refers to culture and previous experiences only with her language-minority

students. This may suggest Anita's belief that culture is important for language-minority students because of low self-esteem. Low self-esteem may be related to Schumann's acculturation theory (1978b) which "posits that it is social distance which affects the degree to which a second language group acquires the language of a particular target language (TL) group" (cited in Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991 p. 181). Once again, Maldonado-Guzman's (1980) ethnocentric view emerges as Anita's actions imply that non language-minority students have nothing to learn because they share the dominant culture. That belief is questionable as exploring one's culture and learning about the cultures of others is fundamental to cross-cultural understanding for all students.

Unlike Anita, Joshua and Laura refer to speed of the lesson, their rate of speech and choice of vocabulary when discussing their language-minority students' influence on lesson implementation. They both suggest that they alter their rate of speech and choice of vocabulary somewhat, but are cautious because they are concerned that the other students in the class remain challenged.

Intuitively, Joshua and Laura appear to understand Krashen's (1982) input hypothesis, which states that language is acquired by understanding messages or receiving comprehensible input just beyond the learner's level of grammar and lexical competence. Krashen (1985) suggests second language learners move from i (the current level of comprehensible input) to i + 1 (the next step that is beyond the level that the language learner easily understands). Using a simplified register, language just beyond the current level of the students, the teacher can facilitate comprehensible input. However, Joshua and Laura appear to be conflicted because of the non language-minority students in their classes.

Third, all of the teacher informants implied that regardless of the student population, good teaching is good teaching. Hence, instructional practices that are based on sound educational principles are appropriate for all students. The fact that Anita, Joshua and Laura believe that sound educational practices are effective for all students suggests the student as having a lesser role than the teacher or the strategy, and disregards individual differences. As previously discussed, individual differences, such as motivation, aptitude, personality, and cognitive style, influence second language development (Littlewood, 1984; Ellis, 1986, Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991) and learning in general.

Specifically, Anita mentioned using an instructional technique called the word bank which encourages students to take risks by selecting words from a vocabulary list. Risk-taking, according to Beebe (1983) varies according to the situation and the social setting. Although moderate risk-taking may be optimal, Beebe maintains that "moderate" is different for different students. Moreover, culture is an additional variable in understanding the instructional effectiveness of risk-taking. Beebe suggests that different cultures may value risk-taking to varying degrees. This is particularly important in Anita's classroom, as she assumes that her language-minority students will benefit equally from the word bank technique.

During the interviews, Anita had the most instructional practices to share. This may be because of her years in the classroom or that she has been to more staff development workshops dealing with language-minority students than Joshua and Laura combined. One strategy, rephrasing, was mentioned by all three teacher informants. Used by ESL teachers, rephrasing has two purposes: clarification and understanding. Clarification is the more obvious

purpose for rephrasing; it assists teacher-student comprehension. The second purpose for rephrasing is "understanding."

According to Curran (1972), providing an appropriate response which may be rephrasing, the teacher demonstrates that s/he has listened to the student. This results in the student feeling that what s/he says is important. "Understanding" is a critical component to second language learning (Curran, 1972).

Anita, Joshua and Laura appear to rephrase to assist clarification. They reported that they rephrased or had the students' rephrase when there was lack of comprehension. Joshua is the only teacher informant that was told by his department chairperson that rephrasing as a general rule is inappropriate for his students because it discourages them from listening to the teacher or one another. By not explaining the purposes of rephrasing to his department chairperson, Joshua may be unfamiliar with the dual purposes of rephrasing for language-minority students.

Teacher Efficacy

An examination of the self-reported instructional practices that Anita, Joshua and Laura say they use with their language-minority students provides the context for the first topic of this section which is teacher efficacy. All three teacher informants mention the potential ineffectiveness of their instructional practices with language-minority students. This contradicts their beliefs that good teaching is good teaching and may imply a lack of confidence or low personal efficacy. For example, Anita maintains that the strategy she uses for Luz in spelling is not working. Her criterion for knowing whether the strategy works is based on Luz's ability to memorize.

Because many of his students do not speak out in class, Joshua doubts the effectiveness of his developmental lessons. According to Joshua, language-minority student silence is caused by poor English, lack of confidence, culture and mispronunciation.

According to Labov (1972) student silence, specifically in African-Americans, is caused by the assumption that they will be accountable for their words. Labov found that some students who were "nonverbal" in the classroom, were extremely talkative with their peers outside of the classroom. Beebe (1983) suggests that similar behavior occurs with some language-minority students.

Culture is suggested by Joshua as a reason for Asian student silence. Bannai (1981) reviewed studies on Asian and non-Asian class participation and found that the Asians participated less. Bannai suggests that Asians tend to adhere to the teacher-as-authority which impacts on their willingness to participate. Moreover, as previously discussed, many Asian students are taught to respect the teachers' authority (Tang, personal communication, July 8, 1992; Burnaby and Sun, 1989) which implies a lesser emphasis on student participation and questioning. Traditional ways of teaching and learning, stemming from Confucius, emphasize rote memorization (Shu, 1985). Family tradition and values encourage active listening in school. Therefore, student silence should not be confused with passivity.

Finally, Laura frequently questions her abilities and her instructional strategies in working with language-minority students. Low personal efficacy is related to lower classroom achievement (Ashton and Webb, 1986).

Closely related to doubts about instructional effectiveness are doubts about language-minority students' ability to comprehend aspects of the lesson. Anita and Laura mention strategies such as, calling on their language-

minority students or monitoring their oral participation to check comprehension. These may not be the most effective strategies in light of Krashen's (1985) input hypothesis and/or Cummins' (1979) distinction between BICS and CALPS.

According to Krashen (1985) early second language development is characterized by the language-minority student's ability to comprehend and inability to accurately produce the target language. Cummins (1979) suggests that language can be interpersonal or academic. Lack of understanding of Krashen's input hypothesis and Cummins' BICS and CALPS may result in inaccurate assessment of language-minority students' language abilities. Whereas some language-minority students may be talkative in the target language on a more basic and interpersonal level, the demands of participating in an academic lesson may be beyond the language-minority student's ability to produce. It is conceivable then that language-minority students may understand much more than they can produce, and the academic demands may leave frequently chatty language-minority students silent. Therefore, calling on students or monitoring their oral participation alone are ineffective strategies for checking comprehension.

Notions of Language Proficiency

Understanding the teacher informants' implicit conceptions of language proficiency is important because it has an impact on decisions of instructional practices and assessment of language-minority students' ability.

Language proficiency was initially thought to include only grammar and lexis (Harley et al., 1990; Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991). Although a definition of consensus does not exist, briefly tracing the evolution of

language proficiency through the works of Chomsky (1965), Hymes (1972), Cummins (1980), Canale and Swain (1980) and Harley et al. (1990) is informative.

Rejecting Chomsky's (1965) notion of language competence as tantamount to grammatical competence, Hymes (1972) coined the term "communicative competence." Communicative competence accounts for the ability to use language in socially appropriate ways. Hymes' work was seminal as it implied a broader view of language competence (Cummins, 1980; Canale and Swain, 1980; Brown, 1987; Harly, Cummins, Swain, Allen, 1990).

Cummins (1980) described language proficiency as composed of cognitive/academic language proficiency (CALP) "which can be assessed by a variety of reading, writing, listening and speaking tests" (p. 176) and basic interpersonal skills (BICS) which includes accent, fluency and sociolinguistic competence. Cummins' recognition of the sociolinguistic component of language proficiency is similar to Canale and Swain's (1980) descriptive model of communicative competence. Canale and Swain (1980) posit three types of competence: grammatical, sociolinguistic and strategic. Grammatical competence, similar to that of Chomsky, is the structural component. Sociolinguistic competence, based on Hymes, is the socially appropriate use of language. Strategic competence is having strategies to compensate for the breakdown in communication.

Most recently Harley et al. (1990), in their conceptualization of language proficiency, includes Cummins' (1980) distinction between CALPS and BICS, and Canale and Swain's (1980) descriptive model of communicative competence. Language proficiency, then, is comprised of the four skills: reading, writing, listening, speaking, and minimally three types of competence: grammatical, sociolinguistic and strategic. In addition, a broad view of language

proficiency considers the demands of the mainstream classroom on language-minority students, and includes not only the cognitive dimension but the "interactional" and "instructional-task" demands as well (Richards, 1990 p. 147).

An analysis of some of the instructional practices that the teacher informants' say they use with their language-minority students implies a fairly limited conception of language proficiency and understanding of the demands of the mainstream classroom. For example, Anita has her language-minority students reading aloud and doing cloze exercises and Joshua has some of his language-minority students making vocabulary lists and writing definitions. These activities imply for Anita and Joshua that vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar are the key elements of language proficiency. This is not to say that vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar are not important; however, as previously mentioned language proficiency includes more than mere structural competence (Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991).

Anita and Joshua acknowledge only the grammatical component of communicative competence. This narrow notion of language proficiency may cause an exaggerated emphasis of the study of surface features at the expense of the development of conceptual knowledge. Because of the language-minority students' performance on surface features and the teacher informants' potential belief that vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar are necessary prerequisites for academic work, language-minority students may never have the opportunity to practice higher order skills, such as summarizing, inferring, predicting or informing. This could be extremely detrimental since language-minority students in the regular classroom must not only learn English, they must use English as a vehicle in order to learn.

Likewise, Laura's desire to help her language-minority students with grammatical structures such as "do" and "does" implies not only a limited knowledge of language proficiency, but a lack of understanding of the processes of second language acquisition, specifically natural sequences. A number of studies have shown that children, regardless of L1 background and L2 environment, acquire negative structures and interrogatives in a developmental sequence (Dulay, Burt and Krashen, 1982; Littlewood, 1984; Ellis, 1986; Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991). For example, in the acquisition of negative structures, learners pass through four major stages: no + x (no is happy), no/don't v (John don't come), aux-neg (I can't play) and analyzed don't (she doesn't drink) (Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991). These sequences may account for the developmental errors of "do" and "does."

Likewise, the acquisition of interrogatives consists of a developmental sequence that occurs in stages (Ravem, 1978; Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991). Stage one is characterized by rising intonation (You eat today?) Stage two contains the uninverted WH (+/- aux) (What she is doing?). It is here that developmental errors with "do" and "does" may occur. Stage three is overinversion (Does he know where is it?). Stage four is differentiation (Does he like where it is?).

Less likely the source of Laura's language-minority students' errors with "do" and "does", but nevertheless important for Laura to know, is some understanding of her students' L1, in this case Chinese. For example the 'do' verb is unique in that it has no meaning. It functions primarily as a tense, number and person carrier. Therefore, there is no equivalent in Chinese (Larsen-Freeman, personal communication, June 9, 1992). Although Chinese speakers are not the only language-minority students who have trouble with "do" and "does", this information may be helpful for Laura.

If Laura were aware of the the natural sequences research, the uniqueness of the "do" auxiliary, and her students L1, she might have a greater understanding of her students' errors. This awareness could lead her to focus more on meaning and communication, rather than form with her language-minority students.

Summary

The three teacher informants basically use the same instructional practices with their classes whether they have language-minority students or not. Furthermore, they believe that instructional strategies that are based on sound educational principles should be effective for all students.

There are some similarities in the way that Anita, Joshua and Laura approach instructing language-minority students in the regular classroom. First, none of the three teacher informants vary their planning process or content selection because of their language-minority students, although their reasons differ. Regardless of the explicit reasons, this means that language-minority students must be prepared to meet the demands of the mainstream classroom. It also means that considering students' background, needs, and abilities is mere rhetoric if teachers do not choose instructional strategies based on individual students.

Second, they all mentioned that while they do not plan differently, the implementation of their lessons is influenced by having language-minority students. This suggests that, although the planning process and content selection is rigid, the teacher informants are cognizant that language-minority students need extra attention during the teaching process. They all use rephrasing as a reinforcement strategy to assist comprehension.

Two topics were discussed in addressing the second research question. The first topic, teacher efficacy, contradicts the teachers' view that sound instructional practices should be effective for all students. All of the teacher informants had doubts about some of their instructional practices and their doubts appear to center around language-minority students' ability to comprehend. This suggests one area of professional development that would be helpful for at least Anita, Joshua and Laura.

The second topic, notions of language proficiency, provides the key to how the teacher informants' rationalize their instructional choices. As stated previously, implicit conceptions of language proficiency may form the basis of instructional practice. And although the teacher informants mention the importance of helping their students learn how to learn, the emphasis on vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar in their instructional practices indicates that the three teacher informants have a fairly narrow view of language proficiency.

This narrow view is somewhat understandable. First, society does not appear to value bilingualism which is evidenced by cutbacks in funding for bilingual programs during the past decade. Specifically, spending for bilingual education has decreased by 47% between 1980 and 1988 (Lyons, 1990). In addition, the majority of programs for language-minority students includes ESL pull-out, transitional bilingual or submersion, which are all assimilationist. Moreover, foreign language classes for majority students have diminished, partially due to the cancelation of foreign language requirements in U.S. universities in the 1960's (Porter, 1990).

Second, U.S. English, which is committed to the preservation of the English language, is gaining in strength and number. This nativist group has a strong lobby with efforts dedicated to the passage of a constitutional

amendment making English the official language of the United States (McGroarty, 1992). To date, 16 states have passed English only legislation (Crawford, 1989).

Third, many people, including Anita, Joshua and Laura have limited or no experience learning a second/foreign language. If at all, the language learning experiences were probably in a foreign language classroom where the instruction emphasized vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar. In other words, personal experience in learning a foreign language, may be one reason why the teacher informants' views of language proficiency are narrow. Broadening the teacher informants' views about language proficiency and helping the teacher informants' understand the demands of the mainstream classroom may result in instructional practices that focus on the development of conceptual knowledge as opposed to surface structures. This is another area which might benefit teachers like Anita, Joshua and Laura.

Professional Development and Support

This section addresses the third and final research question which is, how do the three teacher informants perceive their professional development needs and responsibilities in the education of language-minority students? Answers to this question have implications for teacher educators and staff developers as they plan and implement preservice and inservice teacher education opportunities. Six topics are explored in this section: (a) administrative support; (b) communication; (c) preservice teacher preparation; (d) inservice teacher development; (e) resources; (f) and teacher responsibilities.

Administrative Support

Much educational literature documents the importance of the principal and the administration in initiating a school environment that is conducive to effective teaching (Sarason, 1982; Lieberman and Miller, 1984; Goodlad, 1984). All three teacher informants commented on the lack of formal adminstrative support, not only in dealing with language-minority students, but with general issues, such as curricula, scheduling and materials. Anita, Joshua and Laura's individual themes --- conflict and tension, self-reliance and the induction year --- account partially for their perceptions of lack of support. For example, Anita believes that politics is the force behind her principal's decision-making which frequently leaves the classroom teacher responsible for implementing decisions. Community sentiment, according to Anita, is more important than what actually transpires in the classroom.

Joshua recounts an incident where he asked for help and was accused of being incompetent, an aspect that Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1986) discuss in their review of the literature of the culture of schools. This accusation, although not necessarily the cause of Joshua's self-reliance, surely contributes to his continued isolation and independence. In addition to feeling a lack of support, fear prevents Joshua from initiating new ideas. For example, Joshua mentions a buddy system and seminars led by and for language-minority students as beneficial ideas. Although Joshua has not actively sought support for these ideas, he is convinced that the administration will not only be unhelpful to him if he implements his ideas, but they will take revenge if something questionable happens between students.

Finally, Laura's inexperience in the classroom and in schools may result in her inability to identify what types of support would be helpful to her. Identification of the type of support is the first step to receiving it.

Communication

Closely related to administrative support is that of communication. Like support, communication between the community, the administration, teachers and students is a necessary component for effective schools and teaching yet it is frequently documented as a problematic issue (Lortie, 1975; Sarason, 1982; Lieberman and Miller, 1984; Goodlad, 1984).

"Communication," perhaps overused in the literature, does not mean that "if we just keep speaking with one another all conflicts can be resolved" (Burbules and Rice, 1991 p. 409). It does mean, according to Burbules and Rice (1991) that communication can create, at minimum, partial understandings across differences. Differences are essential in that, "we need to be similar enough to make dialogue possible, but we also need to be different enough to make it worthwhile" (p.409). Finally, Burbules and Rice maintain that dialogue, in order to be effective, contains "communicative virtues" which promote serious and equitable discussion.

> These virtues include tolerance, patience, respect for differences, a willingness to listen, the inclination to admit that one may be mistaken, the ability to reinterpret or translate one's concerns in a way that makes them comprehensible to others, the self-imposition of restraint in order that others may 'have a turn' to speak, and the disposition to express one's self honestly and sincerely. (p.411)

Both Anita and Laura believe that meetings between mainstream teachers and ESL teachers would be beneficial; however, they suggest different approaches to making these meetings a reality. Anita believes that the meetings should be mandated and Laura believes that interested teachers should be invited to attend lunch time sessions where discussions involving a variety of instructional issues could occur. Anita's and Laura's different means towards the same end may be a result of their years of teaching and their beliefs about their roles and responsibilities.

Besides mandated meetings, Anita suggests Individual Educational Profiles (IEP) for language-minority students. According to Anita, IEP's would force communication between the ESL and mainstream teachers, and foster the assessment and instruction of language-minority students as individuals.

IEP's that are collaborative efforts between ESL and mainstream teachers could foster communication. Cummins (1989) warns that unless the assessment process is changed, the communication may result in the same biased assessment and pedagogy that has Latinos dropping out of school at three times the rate of whites (Jusenius and Duarte, 1982) and overrepresented in special education classes in Texas by 300% (Ortiz and Yates, 1983). Cummins (1989) suggests "advocacy-oriented" assessment which acknowledges the social and political structure as a potential cause for language-minority academic difficulties.

Unlike Anita and Laura, Joshua does not even entertain the possibility of communication with other teachers which could, once again, stem from the unwritten norms of his school and the wider profession (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986). Engaging in dialogue with other teachers about language-minority students, according to Joshua, suggests weakness or an attitude of superiority; therefore, he retreats. Furthermore, as discussed throughout this inquiry, Joshua's inability or lack of desire to communicate may be caused by detachment or resistance; strategies that mask anxiety (Horney, 1950).

Preservice Teacher Education

It is predictable that none of the teacher informants were required to study about linguistically diverse students during their preservice teacher education programs. This fact may be seen as the continuation of the marginal status of language-minority students which translates, at a

minimum, into a lack of courses dealing with language-minority issues in teacher education curricula and academic research that links second language development and mainstream teachers. There is much documentation of the discrimination in American educational history towards some people of color (Cummins, 1989). In the current academic arena, not only is course work absent in teacher education curricula, there is a paucity of research. Only one study out of 1200 articles dealt with second language-issues and teacher preparation between 1964 and 1988 (Secada and Grant, 1990).

Inservice Teacher Development

Before comparing the three teacher informants' experiences of inservice education, it should be noted that Anita, Joshua and Laura's opinions and suggestions can not be compared with the research, because there is none available on inservice education for mainstream teachers with language-minority students (Secada and Grant 1990). There is research on inservice education on multiculturalism, racism, prejudice awareness and mainstreaming of special education students that can be cited.

In terms of inservice teacher development, Anita is the only teacher informant who has attended workshops dealing with educating language-minority students. In fact, she has been to 12 two-hour sessions in the last year. The workshops were not cohesive even though they all dealt with issues of second language development. This is unfortunate since inservice workshops that lack reflection time, coherence, and opportunities to apply new knowledge are relatively ineffective (Grant and Secada, 1990).

For differing reasons, Joshua and Laura have never attended workshops dealing with language-minority students. Although he would not mind knowing what the best approach is for teaching language-minority students,

Joshua has explicit reasons for not attending staff development workshops dealing with language-minority students.

First, based on his experiences with inservice education, Joshua does not feel that inservice workshops in their current format will help him with his language-minority students. In fact, he feels that he is as effective with these students as he can be, based on his belief that it is the student who will ultimately succeed or fail. Second, his individual theme of self-reliance suggests that he believes he does not need training to increase his effectiveness. This denial, once again, may be an attempt to hide anxiety. Third, he may feel that learning about language-minority students is not important enough to warrant training, since half of his students are native speakers of English.

Laura has not attended staff development workshops dealing with language-minority students because these students are not a priority for her at this time. However, she would like to know what the best approach is. Once again, the fact that she is a first year teacher may be why language-minority students are not a priority. As a new teacher she is much more focused on self and general teaching concerns, such as classroom management and instructional routines (Kagan, 1992) than the needs of individual students.

With or without attending inservice workshops about language-minority students, all three teacher informants had opinions about inservice staff development. They all insist on the importance of hands-on activities that they can adapt and readily use with their classes. With the pressures classroom teachers face in educating diverse learners, the importance of readily used activities for teachers is predictable. Moreover, not much else can be accomplished during the typical two-hour inservice staff development session.

Only Anita and Laura mention what they need to learn in working with language-minority students which can be applied to inservice staff development. According to Anita, she needs more activities to facilitate L2 use and learning. Second, she wants to learn how to understand her language-minority students better. Third, she mentions her need to learn how to get the language-minority families more involved in school and finally she wants to learn how to assess her language-minority students' abilities. Anita's expressed needs are promising as she demonstrates awareness, the first of three steps which helps educators understand new concepts and implement changes (Grant and Grant, 1985). In addition, facilitating language use (L1 and L2), understanding students better, involving parents and assessing abilities are closely related to what Cummins (1989) suggests as "pedagogy for empowerment" (p.66).

Laura is less specific about what she needs to learn in working with language-minority students, although she does mention assessment. Once again, this suggests her inability to articulate her needs which is a common trait of the inexperienced teacher (Kagan, 1992).

Finally, although Joshua would like to replace training altogether with resources, he does have ideas for staff development. He believes that mainstream teachers would benefit from developing listening skills, increasing their awareness of language-minority students, and learning more about the teaching of basic skills. What is conspicuously absent is sessions on second language development. Throughout the inquiry, Joshua consistently denied the usefulness of specialized knowledge concerning second language development and language-minority students.

Resources

All three of the teacher informants spoke of materials that they believe would help them with their language-minority students, although Laura was once again vague, expressing that she is not familiar with what is available.

Anita and Joshua's requests for resources are somewhat similar. Anita would like vocabulary worksheets and Joshua would like bilingual vocabulary lists. Requesting these types of materials, once again, reflects their notions of language proficiency and their belief of the importance of vocabulary in developing second language proficiency. Joshua's materials requests go a bit farther than addressing surface features of English to the development of conceptual knowledge in English, as he would like to have bilingual content materials. As his students become proficient in English, (L2), he would phase out the content material in L1. This resembles the transitional bilingual approach where students begin studying content in L1 and progress to L2 as soon as possible. Finally, they both would love to have teacher aides in their classrooms; they mention that the ESL classes have teacher aides.

Teacher Responsibilities

The three teacher informants' perceive their responsibilities on a continuum with responsibility resting on the mainstream teacher at one end to the responsibility resting on the language-minority student at the other end. The responsibility being a partnership rests in the middle of the continuum. Placement on the continuum may suggest implicit assumptions about the nature of teaching and learning.

For example, Anita believes that in the best of all possible worlds, it is the classroom teacher that should be responsible for the education of the students in her classroom. This belief assumes a more traditional view of the

role of the teacher, one that is more teacher-centered. However, Anita's view suggests that communication between the ESL and mainstream teacher is essential. It also implies that the ESL teacher, and other professionals in the school are available to support the mainstream teacher in his or her efforts.

Joshua represents the polar view, that is, the responsibility lies within the language-minority student. This belief implies that the role of the teacher is more of a facilitator. He does not negate that the mainstream teacher plays an important role in the academic success of language-minority students. This theme of self-reliance and independence once again emerges. As discussed previously, Joshua's view may be partially based on his experiences as a student which denies the existence of social and political factors that play a part in the academic success or failure of language-minority students.

Finally, Laura's beliefs about responsibilities in educating language-minority students represents the middle of the continuum. She believes that one person alone should not be responsible; that the ultimate responsibility lies within parents, administrators, teachers and the students themselves. This belief implies that the teacher is a collaborator, that decisions and knowledge are co-constructed. Therefore, communication is the key. While Laura's beliefs might be viewed as representing the most ideal of the teacher informants, they may suggest naivete when it comes to the realities of life in schools. However, her ideals and newness to the profession may provide her with the energy to make positive changes.

Summary

This section focused on the final research question; professional development needs and teacher responsibilities in educating language-minority students in the mainstream classroom.

First, it appears that none of the teacher informants feels particularly supported in working with language-minority students, and lack of communication is closely related to the lack of support. Second, none of the teacher informants received any form of preparation for working with language-minority students in their preservice teacher education programs which may be linked to the marginal status of some language-minority groups. Third, only Anita has had inservice staff development dealing with language-minority student issues. According to Anita and the literature on inservice staff development, the content and time frame of her training has not been the most effective.

It appears that without preparation in their teacher education programs and limited inservice staff development, Anita, Joshua and Laura are drawing upon their intuition in educating these students. With the language-minority student population increasing at more than twice the rate of the general student population (U.S. Congressional Record, 1989) the lack of attention in preservice and inservice staff development is problematic.

Fourth, some of Anita and Joshua's requests for resources, specifically vocabulary, reflect their naive views of language proficiency and the demands of the mainstream classroom on language-minority students.

Finally, the three teacher informants represent three views on the continuum of teacher responsibility. This may be indicative of the contradictions in policy, goals, program selection and pedagogy for educating language-minority students (McGroarty, 1992). In addition, there are implicit assumptions of teaching and learning in each view which coincides somewhat with their age and years in the classroom. For example, Anita's belief that the teacher is primarily responsible may implicitly suggest traditional assumptions of teaching and the role of the teacher. She is the oldest teacher

informant and has been in the classroom the longest. Joshua's belief assumes that the teacher is more of a facilitator. His years in the classroom are between that of Anita and Laura. Finally, Laura's belief that the teacher is a partner suggests collaboration and co-construction. She is the least experienced teacher. Perhaps these differences reflect changes in educational thought as well as stages of teacher development.

In the final chapter, conclusions are presented. In addition, implications for practice and directions for future research are explored.

Chapter VI

Conclusions and Implications

Exploring the beliefs, self-reported practices and professional development needs of three mainstream teachers with language-minority students was the focus of this inquiry. First, conclusions that emerged from the data are presented. Second, implications for practice for preservice and inservice teacher education of mainstream, bilingual and ESL teachers are explored. Third, a critique of this study is given. Finally, directions for future research are explored.

It is important to note that the following implications are not based solely upon the data and conclusions of Anita, Joshua and Laura's case histories. They are based on the the researcher's experiences as a teacher and teacher educator, the researcher's beliefs and assumptions that have driven this study, the researcher's insights gained from conducting this inquiry and the literature.

Conclusions

The analysis from the case histories reveals that: (a) the teacher informants hold tacit and conscious beliefs about language-minority students, some of which may be based on hearsay and misinformation; (b) the teacher informants do not vary their planning because of language-minority students, but reported that they often vary their lesson implementation; (c) selection and implementation of instructional practices may be based on naive notions of language proficiency and the demands of the mainstream classroom; (d)

and the teacher informants draw almost entirely upon their experience and intuition in educating language-minority students because of a lack of preservice teacher preparation and ineffective or nonexistent inservice teacher development.

Implications for Practice

With Anita, Joshua and Laura's case histories in mind, the purpose of this section is to discuss implications for practice surrounding issues related to the growing number of mainstream teachers who are responsible for the education of language-minority students. Although the first three conclusions reflect beliefs and self-reported instructional practices, the focus of the implications is on preservice and inservice teacher education because it is through teacher education opportunities that beliefs and instructional practices may be treated.

The following implications are aimed at teacher educators, staff developers and teachers. However, since schools are governed by school boards, which in turn are made up of community members and influenced by communities, the implications may also be relevant for policy makers, administrators, and parents.

Teacher Educators and Preservice Teacher Preparation

Regardless of the three teacher informants' beliefs, self-reported instructional practices and professional development needs, they have not been prepared to instruct the language-minority students in their classrooms. This lack of preparation and the absence of course work in teacher preparation curricula is distressing. It is not as if immigration and student diversity is a new phenomenon. This nation was founded by immigrants.

However, the contemporary issue is how to adapt the curriculum for linguistically and culturally diverse students (Wong-Fillmore and Meyer, 1992).

Furthermore, even as educational policy towards immigrants has shifted, all students have a right to a quality education. According to Cummins (1989) inadequately preparing new teachers for the challenge of educating linguistically and culturally diverse students is one example of the marginal status of some language minority groups.

The fact that the three teacher informants were not prepared to instruct linguistically and culturally diverse students during preservice preparation might be excusable if they had studied in rural America; however, they all studied in or around one of the largest urban areas in the United States. Even that excuse would be weak since demographic shifts demonstrate that language-minority students and their families are not solely concentrated in urban areas (Waggoner, 1988; Trueba, 1989).

Moreover, with current demographic trends, it is most likely that the three teacher informants are not the only mainstream teachers who have or will have language-minority students. In fact, nearly one quarter of this nation's teaching force has at least one or more students that are not proficient in English and over 50% of all teachers interact with language-minority students throughout the school day (Bell, 1984; Penfield, 1987). Furthermore, one third of the current language-minority population is under the age of 18, suggesting that regardless of immigration trends the percentage of language-minority students in U.S. public schools is anticipated to increase (Cantoni-Harvey, 1987).

Besides the ethical dimension of neglecting to adequately prepare teachers to instruct the growing numbers of language-minority students in

this nation's schools, there is an economic imperative as well. Latino students, for example, fall consistently behind white students in reading, writing and mathematics achievement (U.S. Department of Education, 1988). The academic differences between children of color and white students begin early and the gap widens as the years pass. By the end of first grade, Latino students are six months behind whites in achievement scores. By the 12th grade, they are three years behind (Haycock and Navarro, 1988). The drop-out rate for some language-minority groups, specifically Latinos, is proportionately higher than that of the general school population (Lara, Minch and Hoffman, 1990). With an ever changing job market which requires skilled employees, there is much less opportunity for those who fail in school.

Neglecting to prepare teachers for the education of culturally and linguistically diverse students at best reflects this nation's blindness towards the existence of these students and demographic trends, and at worst reflects the institutional racism that exists in many of this nation's schools.

New directions.

In some senses it is difficult to discuss needed changes in teacher preparation because of the insufficient research available into the nature and quality of such programs (Lanier and Little, 1986; Howey and Zimpher, 1989). However, waiting for "all the data" is counterproductive as the profession would be better served by taking Martin Luther King's advice of "getting on with it" (cited in Lather, 1991).

It appears that the majority of preservice teacher preparation programs are similar in philosophy, that is, they perpetuate the status quo. In fact, according to Feiman- Nemser (1990) teacher education programs with a "critical-social orientation" are clearly in the minority. Currently, debates

about length, format and content of teacher preparation programs abound, yet they are housed in predominantly technical or reductionist conceptions of teaching which are characterized by fixed theories, the dominant perspective and value-free notions. This may result in teacher preparation programs and reforms that are basically similar to the status quo, lack alternative designs and fail to keep pace with the changing student population (Lanier and Little, 1986; Howey and Zimpher, 1989; Ginsberg and Clift, 1990).

Embracing a more critical conception of teaching and learning, which considers the social reality of a diverse student population, the sociocultural and political structures of society and schooling, and the possibilities of knowing (Lather 1991) may facilitate the creation of innovative teacher preparation curricular designs. However, this implies that teacher educators are willing to acknowledge, reflect on and discuss the marginality that many students of color have historically had throughout American educational history. This reflection and discussion may subsequently raise sociopolitical questions which may be painful and disturbing to those that uphold the status quo. Perhaps that is why resistance to change is so prevalent. The point is that there will be resistance to change, frequently veiled in misinformation, that will protect the old guard. It will take teacher educators who are not afraid to question existing curricular decisions, to admit that they may have to learn more about areas which they are unfamiliar and to collaborate with other educators in redesigning programs that will begin preparing teachers for the demands of a changing student population.

To some, a logical solution to preparing preservice teachers for educating linguistically and culturally diverse students would be merely adding a new course to the existing teacher preparation curricula. However, upon deeper reflection, there are problems with this approach. First, as

general knowledge and the knowledge base of teaching increases, the "buffet" approach of simply adding more courses makes little sense as there is just so much "food that can fit on one plate." As it stands, teacher preparation programs are already criticized as being fragmented (Lanier and Little, 1986; Howey and Zimpher, 1989). Having more courses does not necessarily mean better preparation.

Second, is the "hidden curriculum." Originally described by Jackson (1968) the hidden curriculum may be defined as the covert messages that are sent to students via the overt curriculum (Ginsberg and Clift, 1990). In other words, tacking on a course or two about linguistically diverse students implies that teaching knowledge in itself is fragmented, and that it is the preservice students' responsibility to make the necessary connections. In other words, the message sent to the mostly white, female, middle class prospective teachers (Lanier and Little, 1986; Grant and Secada, 1990) may be that issues surrounding linguistically and culturally diverse students are not important enough to be integrated into the curriculum (Giroux and McLaren, 1987).

This is not to say that adding course work as an option should be dismissed. To some, adding a course about linguistically and culturally diverse students to the existing teacher preparation curriculum might elevate the importance of these students.

More important however, is the notion of change. Change is a complicated process and voluntary involvement of those responsible for implementation is a minimum prerequisite (Sarason, 1982). Therefore, complete program re-design where both the hidden and overt curriculum send messages of inclusion is not necessarily advocated here, although that may be the ultimate goal. It is understood that because of limited resources,

time, knowledge, awareness and courage of those who are responsible, adding or re-designing new course work may be a first and realistic step.

There is no formula for preparing teachers for the challenges of educating the growing numbers of language-minority students in mainstream classrooms. Even with research, there is a danger that findings will be translated into "research-based prescriptions" for teacher preparation (Zumwalt, 1988). However, if adding course work to existing curricular offerings is the chosen option, the following content and processes might be considered. Since teacher preparation was not the focus of this study, the following content and process suggestions are not prescriptions. They are based on in-depth conversations with the teacher informants, the researchers' experience as a teacher educator and the literature.

First, because of the diversity of language-minority students and the programs available for these students, the knowledge base should be drawn from a spectrum of areas. Suggested content might include: demographic trends; the nature of bilingualism; sociolinguistics, which includes language variation; demands of the mainstream classroom; sociocultural and political structures of schools and society; the role of bilingual/ESL teachers and the nature of bilingual/ESL classrooms; processes of second language development; notions of language proficiency and communicative competence; and assessment of language-minority students.

Content selected across disciplines provides an excellent opportunity for professors to teach interdepartmentally. For example, professors from the department of second language education could teach those courses that deal with second language acquisition and sociolinguistics. This interdisciplinary exchange is an excellent way for interdepartmental collaboration. In addition, outstanding ESL and bilingual teachers could teach those courses that focus on

the role of the ESL and bilingual teacher. This will provide preservice students the opportunity to engage themselves with actual classroom practitioners.

Second, because of the diverse content and the diversity of students within teacher preparation programs, a problem-posing model which assumes that knowledge is co-constructed, may be the most effective approach for preservice students. Cochran-Smith (1991) asserts that problem-posing conveys an image to student teachers about the relationship that they have to knowledge. After an understanding of some of the knowledge base, preservice students may select a content area, programmatic approach, age, ethnic or racial group to pose problems or questions and begin investigating. Investigation may take the form of library research, classroom observations (ESL and mainstream), and interviewing (students or teachers). The result may be that the preservice students pose problems and learn about issues surrounding the education of linguistically diverse students that they perceive are important to them and their upcoming teaching careers.

With the widespread documentation of demographic and immigration trends, it would be irresponsible for teacher educators to continue excluding the education of culturally and linguistically diverse students in teacher preparation curricula. Whether teacher educators redesign existing programs or add course work, failing to adequately prepare teachers for the likelihood that they will have at least one language-minority student in their classes yearly will result in similar situations to that of Anita, Joshua and Laura. There is enough of a knowledge base of bilingualism, second language acquisition and pedagogy and critical theory that mainstream teachers should not have to rely solely on intuitive wisdom that may be based on ethnocentric beliefs and limited or erroneous information.

ESL/Bilingual Teacher Educators and ESL/Bilingual Preservice Teacher Preparation

The dilemmas and challenges of three mainstream teachers with language-minority students has been the focus of this inquiry. However, a word about ESL/bilingual preservice teacher preparation seems justified for two reasons. First, the analysis of this study has corroborated Penfield's findings (1987), that there is a lack of understanding between mainstream teachers and ESL/bilingual teachers. Therefore, both mainstream teacher educators and ESL/bilingual teacher educators have a responsibility to address this issue. Second, due to chronic ESL/bilingual teacher shortages, mainstream teachers will clearly be working with language-minority students, perhaps alongside ESL/bilingual teachers or perhaps alone. Regardless, mainstream teachers and ESL/bilingual teachers will need to establish, at minimum, a common vocabulary as they attempt to educate linguistically and culturally diverse students.

Current practices.

There is a paucity of research into the nature of second language teacher education programs (Lange, 1990; Richards, 1990). In spite of this situation, most second language teacher education programs are composed of three components. The first component is the knowledge base which draws primarily from linguistics and second language acquisition theory. The second component is based on second language teaching methodology. .The third component is student teaching.

There is a distinction in the second language teacher education literature between the micro context and the macro context of teaching and learning, but it is deceivingly narrow. For example, the micro approach is described as looking at second language teaching from an analytical

perspective, one that focuses on teachers' observable behavior. In contrast, the macro approach, is described as holistic, one that generalizes and infers beyond observable behavior to the whole classroom environment (Richards, 1990). Thinking about second language teaching from a macro perspective is a step in the right direction only if the macro definition is expanded. What is missing, especially for those second language teachers who are being certified for K-12 public school, is a much broader definition of the macro context which includes not only the classroom environment, but the school climate, the community and society at large.

The nature of ESL/bilingual teachers' job responsibilities makes the inclusion of the larger context all the more important in preservice second language teacher preparation programs. Regardless of where one is aligned in the debate about the purposes of ESL and bilingual education and the nature of L2 development, there is at least one indisputable goal. That is, teaching language for ESL/bilingual teachers is a minimal responsibility. Perhaps more important is that ESL/bilingual teachers must not only teach language (L2), but they must teach students how to use L2 as a vehicle to acquire academic content. Therefore, it is essential that ESL/bilingual teachers understand the greater context within which their language-minority students fit, which includes at minimum, understanding the demands of the mainstream classroom, the mainstream teachers' challenges and concerns, the culture of the school and the community.

As evidenced in this study, not one of the three teacher informants had a clear idea of what transpires in the ESL or bilingual classrooms in their school. Given the nature of schools and the isolation of teachers, this lack of knowledge and communication between teachers responsible for the same students is most likely a two-way street. Assuming that the goal of education is

quality instruction for all students, teachers must be responsible for collaborating with other teachers who share the same students.

Collaboration and communication do not necessarily happen spontaneously; it must be learned. It is essential that ESL/bilingual teacher education address the societal context within which language-minority students belong. ESL/bilingual teachers must understand the dilemmas that language-minority students face outside of the language classroom and the challenges that mainstream teachers face. ESL/bilingual teachers must be aware of the potential conflicts between their job responsibilities and the responsibilities of other teachers that work with the same language-minority students. Collaboration must be discussed and practiced. Teaching language is just one part of the ESL/bilingual teacher's job. Teaching students to use the new language as a vehicle for learning and preparing them for academic and social success is perhaps more critical.

A promising second language teacher education program is one at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Campus. Started in 1986-87, this 15 month language teacher preparation program is based on an interactive framework. The structure and organization of schools are studied as places where connections between teachers, schools and learning are made (Keith, 1987). Without necessarily eliminating the components of traditional second language teacher preparation, this framework is well worth exploring in that it puts the societal context of teaching, learning and schooling as primary. This may result in ESL/bilingual teachers who understand the context of schooling, and the importance of collaboration with all teachers who are responsible for the education of linguistically and culturally diverse students.

Staff Developers and Inservice Teacher Development

The austere fact that preservice preparation regarding the education of language-minority students in the mainstream classroom is scarce or nonexistent suggests that mainstream teachers are learning on the job. Twenty-five percent of this nation's teachers (like Anita, Joshua and Laura) could be drawing solely upon their intuitive wisdom in educating their language-minority students (Lara, Minch and Hoffman, 1990). This is not to say that intuitive wisdom has little value; however, as in the cases of the teacher informants, there is a likelihood that some erroneous beliefs and misinformation may form the basis of their actions.

For example, Laura believes that her language-minority students have additional social and psychological difficulties that account for their behavior in school. Before validating these beliefs, Laura lowers her expectations for these students. This is just one example of potential erroneous beliefs having an impact on classroom behavior.

Before exploring some implications and suggestions for the process and content of inservice teacher development, there are some suppositions that are similar to those implied in the preservice section. First, as suggested for preservice teacher education, technical, purely rational and value-free notions of teaching and learning should be replaced with more critical conceptions of teaching and learning for the purpose of encouraging more innovative inservice staff development designs. Second, staff development options should be chosen in accordance with the diversity of the student population, school context, teacher experience and capability. In other words, like preservice teacher education, there is no set formula for the process and content of effective inservice teacher development. Third, a problem posing

model, based on the teachers' prior knowledge, experiences and need is suggested.

To date, there is no published research pertaining to inservice teacher education for classroom teachers with language-minority students (Grant and Secada, 1990). Nevertheless, at least in terms of process, there is general agreement among educators as to what is an "ineffective and undesirable" inservice teacher development model (Fullan, 1990). One-shot deals, that are irrelevant, abstract and lack follow-up are set to fail. Moreover, staff development that is conducted by someone lacking empathy, knowledge and a depth of understanding of the lives of teachers and the culture of the school are set for failure. Interestingly, the staff development opportunities that were available for Anita, Joshua and Laura were described with some if not all of the above characteristics.

There is a growing body of literature that supports inservice teacher education models which stress teacher development over time guided by support from the school. Combinations of theory, demonstration, practice and follow-up have proved successful across a variety of content areas (Fullan, 1990). What is essential for inservice staff development are clear goals as to what the desired outcomes of inservice should be and a realistic account of resources, commitment and time. Clarity of goals, consideration of resources, commitment, and time should drive the in-service development model. For example, if a small group of teachers show an interest in discussing assessment issues concerning language-minority students, a voluntary discussion group could be formed. Out of this small group, specific questions or topics could be generated that may be answered within the group, by other teachers (classroom, ESL or bilingual), or an outside expert. If the school environment is one that fosters collegiality and security to ask questions then

the possibilities are endless. What is important is that the process and content be driven by the teachers themselves.

A more specific suggestion for inservice teacher development which is directly related to Anita, Joshua and Laura's case histories, is the notion of teacher reflection. Although Dewey (1933) wrote about reflection, the concept and practice was popularized by Schon (1983) who began addressing the topic (Sparks-Langer and Colton, 1991). Sparks-Langer and Colton (1991) suggest that the popularity of teacher reflection was a result of the "overly technical and simplistic view of teaching that dominated the 1980's" and the realization "that teaching is a complex situation-specific and dilemma-ridden endeavor" (p. 37).

Since Schon's writing there has been a plethora of researchers, educators and practitioners who have studied, defined and used the concept of reflection and reflective thinking. Sparks-Langer and Colton (1991) in their review describe three elements of teacher reflection as "the cognitive" "the critical" and "the reflective" (p. 37). The cognitive element is the most technical of the three elements in that it focuses on teacher planning and decisions and leaves ethics and morals unexplored. The critical and reflective elements focus on the goals, values and societal influences that drive thought and personal interpretations of teachers' experiences, respectively.

Because of the demands of teachers, the time frame of many inservice opportunities and the emphasis on observable outcomes, the cognitive element of reflection is most likely emphasized over the critical and the reflective. This is understandable as teachers perceived needs and the day to day demands of the classroom must be addressed. However, if one assumes that educating the growing number of diverse students is dilemma-ridden and context-specific, the critical and reflective need to be emphasized as well. Articulating

and understanding beliefs, interpreting personal experiences, understanding moral dilemmas and discussing sociopolitical outcomes of teaching, are just as essential as concrete content knowledge for teachers to problem-pose. Therefore, in order to balance teachers' perceived needs, staff developers may have to redesign inservice time frames and adjust expectations.

Specific examples of the power of self-reflection emerged during the process of this inquiry. All three teacher informants, without being explicitly asked, commented on the interview process, began to pose questions and engaged in dialogue with the researcher about language-minority students, schools and the greater societal influences. For example, on two separate occasions Anita called the researcher to discuss incidents regarding the language-minority students in her classroom. Like Anita, Joshua called the researcher and mailed a student composition that he felt was particularly interesting. In addition, he explicitly commented on the process of talking about language-minority students during the interviews.

> Anytime I speak to someone, it forces me to re-evaluate and make assessments and adjustments ... the more that I hear myself say things the more that I will be conscious to do them.

Finally, Laura also called the researcher during the months that the inquiry took place to raise questions and to share incidents. Moreover, after the data were collected, Laura asked for specific materials focusing on second language acquisition.

What the above examples suggest is that Anita, Joshua and Laura responded by engaging in dialogue about issues and concerns that they face as classroom teachers. In the above examples, the teacher informants were self-reflecting. While self-reflection is desirable, reflection that is guided and shared has additional benefits.

For example, this study revealed that the three teacher informants hold beliefs about their language-minority students which may be based on misinformation. Anita believes that language-minority students are at a disadvantage if they speak their native language at home. Based on his personal beliefs, Joshua believes that academic success or failure rests predominantly in the hands of the individual language-minority student. Finally, Laura believes there is minimal language in computational math problems.

What is important about the teacher informants' beliefs, is that they may result in well intentioned, but negative behavior. What is specifically needed in relation to the above examples is: (a) information about native language development and social and political structures of schools; (b) opportunities to articulate and reflect on the causes of their beliefs; (c) adjustment and sharing of new beliefs and subsequent new behaviors. The point is that new information and understanding of the dimensions of beliefs may cause awareness, reassessment and a change in behavior.

Inservice staff development does not have to be limited to experts spouting current research or knowledge. Teachers have intuitive wisdom, knowledge, experience and classroom dilemmas that may form the basis for ongoing staff development, which could be constructed by the teachers themselves. The fact that Anita, Joshua and Laura began to raise their own questions as a result of the interview process suggests that other teachers may be capable of doing the same.

Like preservice teacher education, embracing a more critical conception of teaching and learning is suggested in order to support innovative staff development models that are based on the dilemmas and realities of classroom teachers. Although there is no specific formula for

effective inservice teacher education, teachers have the wisdom and experience to articulate their needs and co-construct their own context-specific staff development opportunities. This may take more time than traditional staff development models, which suggests that staff development opportunities need to be adjusted to facilitate teacher growth over time. Reflection and dialogue, guided or alone, as exemplified by Anita, Joshua and Laura's participation in this study, appear to be beneficial for on going teacher development.

Up until now the discussion of inservice staff development has focused mainly on process. And although generalizations cannot be made from the three teachers informants alone, specific content suggestions for inservice teacher development emerged from the data.

First, since the teacher informants were not prepared during preservice teacher education, those content topics that were suggested previously apply. Demographic trends, the nature of bilingualism, sociolinguistics, processes of second language acquisition, notions of language proficiency, language-minority student assessment, ESL and bilingual classrooms and programs and the social and political structures of schools, could be elicited in a problem-posing format.

Second, Anita and Laura indirectly referred to strategic competence (Canale and Swain, 1980) and instructional task demands (Richards and Hurley, 1990) when they discussed that their students need to learn how to learn. Specifically, Anita maintained that all her students need to learn organizational and study skills and Laura questioned if language-minority students were learning how to learn in their ESL classes. Focusing on the demands of the classroom and communicative competence would be another priority area for inservice staff development.

Finally, since there is a lack of understanding between mainstream, ESL and bilingual teachers, they could all be invited to participate in joint inservice teacher development. In fact, current trends in New York State suggest a reconceptualization of teachers' roles. Assuming a special education model where students are mainstreamed into the regular classroom, special education teachers would act as consultants to the regular classroom teacher.instead of staffing separate classes or pull-out programs. Implications for teachers and staff developers of the teacher-consultant model would be increased collaboration and communication between teachers.

Teachers

Up until now, the implications and suggestions have focused primarily on teacher educators and staff developers. This section focuses on individual teachers and the implicit responsibilities that go with being a professional. The point here is not to disregard the importance of the sociopolitical structures that have been referred to throughout this inquiry, but to acknowledge that individual teachers have control and responsibility for their daily decisions.

There are ethical dimensions of teacher behavior. For example, Joshua does not attempt to communicate with his colleagues about classroom issues and concerns because of the unwritten norms in his school against this type of behavior. Therefore, he retreats. There are moral implications to this retreat. It is similar to the ostrich with its head in the sand. Teachers have a responsibility to engage in dialogue, raise issues and collaborate with other teachers, parents, administrators and policy makers about questions and concerns that arise in the education of all students. Moreover, teachers have

an ethical and moral responsibility to participate actively in their schools as agents of change and reform (Cochran-Smith, 1991).

If teachers are products of traditional educational systems that implicitly seek to replicate the status quo, how can they learn to become change agents and reformers? There is no easy answer to this question; however, teacher leaders, change agents and reformers do exist. Perhaps, through reflection, dialogue and collaboration with experienced change agents within schools, more traditionally educated teachers will discover the moral basis and social responsibilities that are inherent in teaching. Cochran-Smith (1991) calls this process "'collaborative resonance,' the intensification of opportunities to learn from teaching through the co-labor of communities" (p.304).

The lack of support in some schools makes it difficult for teachers to communicate and collaborate. However, this difficulty can not be used as an excuse. Teachers, like Joshua, can seek ideas or feedback from outside sources. Friends, experts and mentors can provide insights without passing judgement and new ideas can be taken back to school and implemented.

Implications for Research

After critiquing this study for those who may wish to replicate it, future research directions that have emerged from the findings, implications and literature are discussed.

A Critique

It has been said that hindsight is 20/20. Such is the case for educational research. This section focuses on triangulation, the use of multiple data

collection techniques to insure internal validity, that in retrospect, might have been done differently.

Although the primary data collection source was the semi-structured interview, the teacher informants' journals provided an additional source, which at times affirmed or contradicted the interview data. One problem was length and depth of the teacher informants' journal entries. Despite the fact that Anita, Joshua and Laura wrote in their journals, their entries were more often short notes or brief descriptive anecdotes. Lack of time and lack of direction may be reasons for the brevity of the teacher informants journal entries.

In order to encourage the teacher informants to write during the course of the data collection period, a page with an open-ended question at the end of each interview session could be provided. This page with a suggested topic or provocative question may provide the needed incentive or direction that some teacher informants need.

In addition to providing more structure to the teacher informant journal writing, methods to understand teacher beliefs need to be explored. As documented in the literature and experienced by the researcher herself, getting at teachers' unobservable behavior or beliefs is in itself dilemma-ridden. Minimally, some teachers may not be aware of their beliefs or they may be unable to articulate them. Therefore, researchers should be encouraged to try alternative ways that may get at teachers beliefs.

One way that was discovered after the data collection was well underway was the adapted repertory grid technique (Munby, 1984). Through eliciting constructs and arranging them on a grid, Munby was able to get at Ellen's beliefs. For the purpose of future studies, the repertory grid technique, along with the semi-structured interviews, classroom observations and journal

entries, holds potential as a primary data or secondary data source. This additional data may be useful for affirming or contradicting other data sources.

Future Research

Since there are very few studies that explore the mainstream teachers' perspective in the education of language-minority students, there is much room for additional research. Moreover, there is room for both positivistic and interpretive inquiries. As a result of this inquiry, three areas of additional study have emerged which are housed in teacher beliefs, teacher knowledge and teacher development.

Teacher beliefs.

There is general agreement in the literature about the importance of understanding teacher beliefs. In the last 20 years there has been greater interest, and subsequently more research into the nature of teacher beliefs. Most of the research has been focused on either methodological issues or description of teacher beliefs. The questions that are currently being asked may provide greater understanding into the relationships between beliefs and action. Some of these questions are: (a) how are beliefs formed? (b)how are they sustained? (c) how are they supported and weakened? (Nespor, 1987) (d) what is the relationship between beliefs and practice? (Richardson, Anders, Tidwell and Lloyd, 1992). Specifically related to this inquiry is the importance of understanding the above questions in relation to the mainstream teachers' beliefs about language-minority students in the regular classroom.

Teacher knowledge.

Understanding what teachers need to know in order for students to reach their fullest potential in the classroom is an area that educational researchers are currently exploring. Recently there has been much debate about what comprises the knowledge base of teachers. During this inquiry it became clear that the three teacher informants' had little understanding about the nature of language proficiency and the demands of the mainstream classroom. There may be an assumption underneath teacher knowledge, in this case knowledge of language proficiency, that implies that greater teacher knowledge will translate into student benefit. Therefore, a research question that emerged from this study is: how do teachers' understanding of language-proficiency relate to greater academic success for language-minority students?

Teacher development.

Throughout this inquiry, the importance of communication, dialogue and reflection has been advocated as processes that may facilitate teacher development. In addition to these processes, there has been a distinct absence in the teacher informants' interview data about the sociopolitical structures that influence the lives of language-minority students. Therefore, it would be interesting to know how engaging in dialogue about the sociopolitical structures that influence language-minority students is related to beliefs, practice, and reform.

Finally, since information on staff development for mainstream teachers with language-minority students is scarce, the development of grounded theory is needed. Case studies of effective inservice models is a logical first step.

Concluding Thoughts

In conducting this inquiry, there have been both distressing and encouraging issues. What has been distressing is the lack of information about language-minority students and the sociopolitical structures within which teachers, students, parents and administrators interact. Furthermore, there is a lack of understanding of second language development, notions of language proficiency and the demands of the mainstream classroom on language-minority students.

What has been encouraging, amidst the teacher informants' perceptions of lack of support and inadequate preservice and inservice teacher education, is the intuitive wisdom and ideas that drive them. The mere fact that Anita, Joshua and Laura voluntarily discussed their beliefs, practices and needs in working with language-minority students in the regular classroom implies that they are interested in and care about these students. Awareness, dialogue and reflection may be the first steps to asking new questions, affirming and changing behavior.

References

Adams, M.A. (1978). Methodology for examining second language acquisition. In E.M. Hatch (Ed.), Second language acquisition: A book of readings. (pp. 277-298). Rowley, MA.: Newbury House.

Ashton, P.T. & Webb, R.B. (1986). Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement. New York: Longman, Inc.

Ayers, W. (1989). The good preschool teacher: Six teachers reflect on their lives. New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 8(1),191-215.

Bannai, H. (1981). Socio-cultural influences on communicaiton development of Asian ESL students. In J. Cameron (Ed.) On TESOL '80: Building bridges. (pp.147-158) TESOL: Washington, D.C.

Beebe, L.M. (1988). Five sociolinguistic approaches to second language acquisition. In. L.M. Beebe (Ed.), Issues in second language acquisition: Multiple perspectives. (pp. 43-77). New York: Newbury House.

Beebe, L.M. (1986). Input: Choosing the right stuff. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), Input in SLA. (pp. 404-414). Rowley, MA.: Newbury House.

Beebe, L.M. (1983). Risk-taking and the language learner. In. H.W. Seliger & M.H. Long (Eds.), Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition. (pp. 39-65). Rowley, MA.: Newbury House.

Bell, T.H. (1984). The conditions of bilingual education in the nation. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Bikson, T.K. (1974). Minority speech as objectively measured and subjectively evaluated. Los Angeles, CA.: University of California (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED131 135).

Borg, W.R. & Gall, M.D. (1989). Educational research: An introduction. (5th ed.). New York: Longman, Inc.

Brinton, D.M., Snow, M.A. & Wesche, M.B. (1989). Content-based second language instruction. New York: Newbury House.

Brophy, J. & Everston, C. (1976). Learning from teaching: A developmental perspective. Boston, MA.: Allyn and Bacon.

Brophy, J. & Good, T.L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.) (pp. 328-375). New York: MacMillan and Co.

Brown, D.H. (1987). Principles of language learning and teaching. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Burbules, N.C. & Rice, S. (1991). Dialogue across differences: Continuing the conversation. Harvard Educational Review, 61(4), 393-416.

Burnaby, B. & Sun, Y. (1989). Chinese teachers' views of western language teaching: Context informs paradigm. TESOL Quarterly, 23(2), 219-238.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and learning. Applied Linguistics, 1(1), 1-47.

Cantoni-Harvey, G. (1987). Content-area language instruction: Approaches and strategies. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Cazden, C. (1986a). Classroom discourse. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.) (pp. 432-463). New York: MacMillan and Co.

Cazden, C. (1986b). ESL teachers as language advocates for children. In P. Rigg & D.S. Enright (Eds.), Children and ESL: Integrating perspectives (pp. 7-22). Washington, D.C.:TESOL.

Chamot, A.U. & O'Malley, J.M. (1989). The cognitive academic language learning approach. In P. Rigg & V.G. Allen (Eds.), When they don't all speak English. (pp. 108-125). Urbana, ILL.: NCTE.

Chaudron, C. (1988). Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chi, M., R. Glaser & Rees, E. (1981). Expertise in problem solving. Pittsburg, PA.: Learning and Research Development Center, University of Pittsburg.

Chomsky, N. (1965). Aspects of the theory of syntax. Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.

Choy, S.J. & Dodd, D.H. (1976). Standard English-speaking and nonstandard Hawaiian English-speaking children: Comprehension of both dialects and teacher's evaluations. Journal of Educational Psychology, 68(2), 184-193.

Clark, C. M., & Peterson. P.L. (1986). Teachers' thought processes. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. (3rd ed.) (pp. 255-296). New York: Macmillan and Co.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Learning to teach against the grain. Harvard Educational Review, 63(3), 279-310.

Crawford, J. (1989). Bilingual education: History politics theory practice. Trenton, N.J.: Crane Publishing Co. 52-69.

Cummins, J. (1989). Empowering minority students. Sacramento, CA.: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. Review of Educational Research, 49(2), 222-251.

Cummins, J. (1988). Second language acquisition within bilingual education programs. In L.M. Beebe (Ed.), Issues in second language acquisition: Multiple perspectives. (pp. 145-166). New York: Newbury House.

Cummins, J. (1980). The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: Implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue. TESOL Quarterly, 14(2), 175-187.

Cummins, J. (1982). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework. (pp. 3-49). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Assessment and Dissemination Center, California State University.

Curran, C.A. (1972). Counseling-learning: A whole person model for education New York: Grune and Stratton, 57-77.

Dale, T.C., & Cuevas, G.J. (1987). Integrating language and mathematics learning. In J. Crandall (Ed.), ESL Through Content-Area Instruction. (pp. 9-54). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Regents.

Davis-Clerk, A. (1990). Opinions of regular classroom teachers about mainstreaming emotionally handicapped children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Dembo, M.H., & Gibson, S. (1985). Teachers' sense of efficacy: An important factor in school improvement. Elementary School Journal, 86(2), 174-184.

DeMeis, D.K. & Turner, R.R. (1978). Effects of students' race, physical attractiveness, and dialect on teachers' evaluations. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 3, 77-86.

Dewey, J. (1933). How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process. Chicago, Ill.: D.C. Heath.

Dewey, J. (1965). The relation of theory to practice in education. In. M. Borrowman (Ed.), Teacher education in America: A documentary history (pp.140-171). New York: Teachers College Press (Orig. published 1904).

Diaz, R.M. & Klinger, C. (1991). Towards an explanatory model of the interaction between bilingualism and cognitive development. In E. Bialystok (Ed.), Language processing in bilingual children. (pp. 167-192). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Diaz, S., Moll, L. & Mehan, H. (1986). Sociocultural resources in instruction: A context specific approach. In California State Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education (Ed.), Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language-minority students. (pp. 187-230). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State Department of Education.

Doyle, W. (1983). Academic work. Review of Educational Research, 53(2), 159-199.

Dulay , H. & Burt, M. (1974). Natural sequences in child acquisition. Language Learning, 24(2), 37-53.

Dulay, H., M. Burt & Krashen, S. (1982). Language two. New York: Oxford University Press.

Elbaz, F. (1981). The teacher's "practical knowledge": Report of a case study. Curriculum Inquiry, 11(1), 42-71.

Ellis, R. (1986). Understanding second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

English Plus Information Clearinghouse (1992). The English plus alternative. In J. Crawford (Ed.), Language loyalties: A source book on the official English controversy. (pp. 151-153). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Enright, D.S. (1986). Using everything you have to teach English: Providing useful input to young language learners. In P. Rigg & D.S. Enright (Eds.), Children and ESL: Integrating perspectives. (pp. 113-162). Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods on research in teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.) (pp. 119-161). New York: Macmillan and Co.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990). Teacher preparation: Structural and conceptual alternatives. In W.R. Houston (Ed.). Handbook of research on teacher education. (pp. 212-223). New York: Macmillan and Co.

Feiman-Nemser, S. & Floden, R.E. (1986). The cultures of teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook on research on teaching (3rd ed.) (pp.505-526). New York: Macmillan and Co.

Fullan, M.G. (1990). Staff development, innovation and institutional development. In B. Joyce (Ed.), Changing school culture through staff development. (pp. 3-25). Alexandria, VA.: Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Fuller, F.F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental characterization. American Educational Research Journal. 6, 207-226.

Gallimore, R., Boggs, J. & Jordan, C. (1974). Culture, behavior and education. Beverly Hill, CA.: Sage.

Garcia, E.E. (1990). Educating teachers for language-minority students. In W.R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education. (pp.717-729). New York: Macmillan and Co.

Genesee, F., Tucker, G. & Lambert, R. (1978). An experiment in trilingual education: report 3. In S.T. Carey (Ed.), The Canadian Modern Language Review, 34, 621-643.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: a construct validation. Journal Of Educational Psychology, 76(4), 569-582.

Ginsberg, N.B., & Clift , R.T. (1990). The hidden curriculum of preservice teacher education. In W.R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education. (pp.450-465). New York: Macmillan and Co.

Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1987). Teacher education as a counter public sphere: Notes towards a redefinition. In. T. Popkewitz (Ed.), Critical studies in teacher education. (pp. 266-297). New York: Falmer Press.

Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine Press.

Goetz, J.P., & LeCompte, M.D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. San Diego, CA.: Academic Press.

Good, T.L., & Brophy, J.E. (1987). Looking in classrooms. New York: Harper and Row, Inc.

Good, T.L. & Weinstein, R.S. (1986). Teacher expectations: A framework for exploring classrooms. In K.K. Zumwalt (Ed.), Improving teaching. (pp. 63-86). Alexandria, VA.: Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw Hill.

Grant, C. & Grant, G. (1985). Staff development and education that is multicultural: A study of inservice institute for teachers and principals. British Journal of Inservice Education, 2(1), 6-18.

Grant, C.A., & Secada, W.G. (1990). Preparing teachers for diversity. InW.R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education. (pp. 403-422). New York: Macmillan and Co.

Greene, M. (1986). Thinking about our craft. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Rethinking school improvement. (pp. 13-25). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hakuta, K. (1986). Mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Harber. J. R. (1979). Perspective teachers: Attitudes toward black English. Bethesda, MD. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 181 728).

Harley, B., Cummins, J., Swain, M., & Allen, P. (1990). The nature of language proficiency. In Harley, Allen, Cummins & Swain (Eds.), The development of second language proficiency. (pp. 7-25). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hayakawa, S.I. (1992) The case of official English. In J. Crawford (Ed.), Language loyalties: A source book on the official English controversy. (pp. 94-100). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Haycock, K. & Navarro, M.S. (1988). Unfinished business: Fulfilling our children's promise. Oakland and Los Angeles: Achievement Council.

Heath, S.B. (1983). Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Horney, K. (1950). Neurosis and human growth. New York: W.W. Norton and Co.

Howe, K. & Eisenhart, M. (1990). Standards for qualitative (and quantitative) research: A prolegomemnon. Educational Researcher, 19(4), 2-9.

Howey, K.R. & Zimpher, N.L. (1989). Profiles of preservice teacher education: Inquiry into the nature of programs. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.

Hudson, R.A. (1980). Sociolinguistics. Cambridge, MA.: Cambridge University Press.

Hurd, P.D., Robinson, J.T., McConnel, M.C. & Ross, N.M. (1981) The status of middle and junior high school science. Louisville, CO.: Center for Educational Research and Evaluation, BSCS.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics. (pp. 23-40). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, Inc.

Jackson, P. (1968). Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Janesick, V. (1977). An ethnographic study of a teacher's classroom perspective. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. East Lansing, MI.: Michigan State University.

Jersild, A.T. (1955). When teachers face themselves. New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Jusenius, C. & Duarte, V.L. (1982) Hispanics and job barriers in progress. Washington, D.C.: National Commission for Employment Policy.

Kagan, D.M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research, 62(2), 129-169.

Kaufman, P. & Frase, M.J. (1990). Drop-out rates in the U.S. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, September.

Keith, M.J. (1987). We've heard this song ... or have we? Journal of Teacher Education, 38(3), 20-25.

Kesler, C. & Quinn, M.E. (1987). ESL and science learning. In J. Crandall (Ed.), ESL through content-area instruction. (pp. 55-88). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Krashen, S.D. (1982). Bilingual education and second language acquisition theory. In Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework. (pp. 51-79). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Assessment and Dissemination Center, California State University.

Krashen, S.D. (1985). Input hypothesis: Issues and implications. New York: Longman, Inc.

Labov, W. (1972). Sociolinguistic patterns. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lampert, M. (1984). Teaching about thinking and thinking about teaching. Curriculum Studies, 16(1), 1-18.

Lange, D.L. (1990). A blueprint for a teacher development program. In J.C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), Second language teacher education. (pp. 245-268). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lanier, J. E. & Little, J.W. (1986). Research on teacher education. In W.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.) (pp. 527-569). New York: Macmillan and Co.

Lara, J., Minch, H., & Hoffman, E. (1990). School success for limited English proficient students: the challenge and state response. Council of Chief State School Officers. Washington, D.C.: Resource Center on Educational Equity.

Larrivee, B. (1981). Effect of in-service training intensity on teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming. Exceptional Child, 48(9), 34-39.

Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. (1990). An introduction to second language acquisition research. New York: Longman, Inc.

Lather, P. (1991). Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy within the postmodern. New York: Routledge.

Lemberger, N. (1990). Bilingual education: Teachers' voices. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Lincoln, Y.S. & E.G. Guba (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage.

Littlewood, W. (1984). Foreign and second language learning: Language acquisition research and its implications for the classroom. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Long, M.H. '& Sato, C.J. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H.W. Seliger & M.H. Long (Eds.), Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition. (pp. 268-285). Rowley, MA.: Newbury House.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lucas, T., Henze, R. & Donato, R. (1990). Promoting the success of latino language-minority students: An exploratory study of six high schools. Harvard Educational Review, 60(3), 315-340.

Lyons, J. (1990). The past and future directions of federal bilingual education policy. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. (508) 66-80.

MacMillan, D.L., Keogh, B.K., & Jones, R.L. (1986). Special education research on mildly handicapped learners. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.) (pp. 686-726). New York: Macmillan and Co.

Maldonado-Guzman, A.A. (1980). Theoretical and methodological issues in the ethnographic study of teachers' differential treatment of children in bilingual bicultural classrooms. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Symposium on Policy Implications of Ethnographic Research in Bilingual Education, Council on Anthropology and Education.

Maxwell, J.A. (1992). Understanding and validity in qualitative research. Harvard Educational Review,62(3), 279-300.

McGroarty, M. (1992). The societal context of bilingual education. Educational Researcher, 21(2), 7-9.

McKay, S.L. (1988). Weighing educational alternatives. In S. McKay & S.C. Wong (Eds.), Language diversity: Problem or resource. (pp.338-366). New York: Newbury House.

Merriam, S.B. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass.

Mohan, B.A. (1986). Language and content. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Munby, H. (1984). A qualitative approach to the study of a teacher's beliefs. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 21(1), 27-38.

Munby, H. (1982). The place of teachers' beliefs in research on teacher thinking and decision making, and an alternative methodology. Instructional Science, 11, 201-225.

National Institute of Education (1975). Teaching as clinical information processing. (Report of Panel 6, Conference on Studies in Teaching) Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Nespor, J. (1984) The interaction of school context and teachers' beliefs (R & D Report No. 8023). Austin, TX.: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 260-079).

Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 19(4), 317-328.

Ogbu, J. (1978). Minority education and caste. New York: Academic Press.

Ogbu, J. (1992). Understanding cultural diversity and learning. Educational Researcher, 21(8), 5-14.

O 'Malley, M.J. (1982) Instructional services for limited English proficient children. Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education, 7(1), 21-36.

Ortiz, A.A. & J. R. Yates (1983). Incidence of exceptionality among hispanics: Implications for manpower. Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education, 7(3), 41-54.

Pajares, F.M. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. Review of Educational Research, 62(3), 307-332.

Patton, M.Q. (1990) Qualitative research and evaluation methods. (2nd ed.) Newbury Park, CA.: Sage.

Penfield, J. (1987). ESL: The regular classroom teachers' perspective. TESOL Quarterly, 21(1), 21-39.

Pernell, E., McIntyre, L. & Bader, L.A. (1985). Mainstreaming: A continuing concern for teachers. Education, 106(2), 131-137.

Philips, S.V. (1972). Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm springs Indian children community classrooms. (pp. 370-394). In C. Cazden, V. John and D. Hymes (Eds.), Functions of language in the classroom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Piatt, B. (1990). Only English? Law and language policy in the United States. Albuquerque: University if New Mexico Press.

Porter, R.B. (1990). Forked tongue: The politics of bilingual education. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Ramirez, A.G., Arce-Torres, E., & Politzer, R.L. (1978). Language attitudes and the achievement of bilingual pupils in English language arts. The Bilingual Review, 5(3), 190-206.

Ravem, R. (1978). Two Norwegian children's acquisition of English syntax. In E.M. Hatch (Ed.). Second language acquisition: A book of readings. (pp. 148-154). Rowley, MA.: Newbury House.

Richards, J.C. (1990). The dilemma of teacher education in second language teaching. In J.C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), Second language teacher education. (pp. 3-15). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C., & Hurley, D. (1990). Language and content: Approaches to curriculum alignment. In J.C. Richards (Ed.), The language teaching matrix. (pp. 144-159). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richardson, V., Anders, P., Tidwell, D., & Lloyd, C. (1991). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices in reading comprehension instruction. American Educational Research Journal, 28(3), 559-586.

Rist, R. (1970). Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. Harvard Educational Review, 40(3), 411-451.

Rosenthal R. & Jacobson, L. (1968). Pygmalian in the classroom: Teacher expectations and pupils' intellectual development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Sarason, S.B. (1982). The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston, MA.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Saville-Troike, M. (1989). The ethnography of communication. (2nd ed.).New York: Basel Blackwell, Inc.

Scarcella, R. (1990). Teaching language minority students in the multicultural classroom. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Schmelkin, L. (1981). Teachers and non-teachers attitudes toward mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 48(1), 42-47.

Schon, D. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York: Basic Books.

Schumann, J. (1978a). Second language acquisition: The pidginization hypothesis. In E.M. Hatch (Ed.), Second language acquisition: A book of readings. (pp. 256-271). Rowley, MA.: Newbury House,

Schumann, J. (1978b). The acculturation model for second language acquisition. In R. Gingras (Ed.), Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching. (pp. 27-50). Arlington, VA.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Sharp, R. & Green, A. (1975). Education and social control: A study in progressive primary education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Shu, F. (1985). American and Chinese: Passage to differences. (3rd. ed.). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Smith, R.P. & Denton, J.J. (1980). The effects of dialect, ethnicity and orientation to sociolinguistics on the perceptions of teaching candidates. Educational Research Quarterly, 5(1), 71-79.

Snow, M.A., Met, M., & Genesee, F. (1989). A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content in second/foreign language instruction. TESOL Quarterly, 23(2), 201-217.

Sparks-Langer, G.M., & Colton, A.B. (1991, March). Synthesis of research on teachers' reflective thinking", Educational Leadership, 48(6), 37-44.

Spradley, J. (1979). The ethnographic interview. Chicago, IL.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1982). Evaluating bilingual education. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Tannen, D. (1990). You just don't understand. New York: Ballantine Books.

Teruya, A. & Wong, J. (1972). The Filipino immigrant child: A handbook for teachers. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Tikunoff, W.J. (1985). Applying significant bilingual instructional features in the classroom. Rosslyn, VA.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Trueba, H.T. (1989). Raising silent voices: Educating the linguistic minorities for the 21st century. New York: Newbury House, Inc.

Underhill, R.G. (1988). Focus on research into practice in diagnostic and prescriptive mathematics; mathematics teachers' beliefs. Focus on Learning Problems in Mathematics, 10(3), 43-57.

United States Congressional Record (1989). Proceedings and debates from the 101st congress. First Session, 135 (25) Washington, D.C.

United States Department of Education (1988). Youth indicators 1988: Trends in the well-being of American youth. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.

Waggoner, D. (1988). Language minorities in the United States in the 1980's: The evidence from the 1980 census. In McKay, S.L. & S.C. Wong (Eds.), Language diversity: Problem or resource? (pp. 69-108). New York: Newbury House.

Watkins, B. (1989, December,13). Colleges urged to train schoolteachers to deal with expected influx of immigrants. Chronicle of Higher Education, 36(15), 41-44.

Weinberg, M. (1977). Minority students: A research appraisal. Washington D.C.: NIE.

Williams, F. (1973). Some research notes on dialect attitudes and stereotypes. In Shuy, R.W. & Fasold, R.W. (Eds.), Language attitudes: Current trends and prospects. (pp 113-128). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Willner, R. (1985). Ten years of neglect: The failure to serve language-minority students in the New York city public schools. New York: Interface, Educational Priorities Panel.

Wong, S.C. (1988a). Educational rights of language minorities. In S.L. McKay & S.C. Wong (Eds.), Language diversity: Problem or resource? (pp.367-386). New York: Newbury House, Inc.

Wong, S.C. (1988b). The language situation of Chinese-Americans. In S.L. McKay & S.C. Wong (Eds.), Language Diversity: Problem or resource? (pp.193-228). New York: Newbury House.

Wong-Fillmore, L. (1991). Second language learning in children: A model of language learning in social context. In E. Bialystok (Ed.), Language processing in bilingual children (pp. 49-69). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wong-Fillmore, L. & Meyer, L.M. (1992). The curriculum and linguistic minorities. In. P. Jackson (Ed.), Handbook of research on curriculum, (pp. 626-658). New York: MacMillan and Co.

Wong-Fillmore, L. & Valadez, C. (1986). Teaching bilingual learners. In W.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd. ed.) (pp. 648-685). New York: Macmillan and Co.

Yin, R.K. (1984). Case study research: Design and method. Beverly Hills, CA.: Sage Publications, Applied Social Research Methods Series (5).

Zumwalt, K. (1988). Are we improving or undermining teaching? In L. Tannen (Ed.), Critical Issues in Curriculum NSSE Eighty-Seventh Yearbook, part one, (pp.148-174). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zumwalt, K. (1986). Teachers and mothers: Facing new beginnings. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Rethinking School Improvement, (pp.129-146). New York: Teachers College Press.

Appendix A Teacher Letter

NANCY CLAIR
144 East 7th Street #E2
New York, New York 10009
(212) 677-9606

January 1991

Dear Colleague:

I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Curriculum and Teaching at Teachers College, Columbia University, and I am requesting your assistance in a dissertation study entitled: Beliefs, Self-Reported Practices and Professional Development Needs of Three Classroom Teachers with Language-Minority Students. Given the fact that approximately 30% of all language-minority students are in regular classrooms, the purpose of this study is to describe mainstream teachers' perspectives as they share in the education of the growing number of these students. Information gathered from this study could provide valuable insights to educators committed to providing the best quality education for language-minority students regardless of what educational services are available to them.

Please fill out the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me in the addressed, stamped envelope as soon as possible. All responses and references to individuals and schools will remain anonymous. If you would be interested in participating further in this study, please include your name address and phone number on question 8.

Thank you in advance for assisting me in this stage of my dissertation. Please feel free to contact me at (212) 677-9606 for any reason. I would be more than happy to answer questions and/or share any portion of my study with you.

Sincerely,

Nancy Clair

Appendix B Screening Instrument

Please respond to the following items and return this questionnaire in the enclosed, addressed, stamped envelope. All responses will remain anonymous. For the sake of the environment, feel free to write on the back of this page if necessary. Thank you.

1) How long have you been teaching?
___ 2 years or less ___ 3 to 6 years ___ more than 6 years

2) What grade are you currently teaching?
___ K to 2 ___ 3 to 5 ___ 6 to 9 ___ 10 to 12

3) Indicate the number of language-minority students you have according to nationality.
____ South American ____ Southeast Asian ____ Japanese____ Indian
____ Pakistani ____ Central American ____ Korean ____ Chinese
____ Caribbean ____ Eastern European _____ other (please indicate)

4) Indicate what kind of training you have had in second language development.
____ no training ____ in-service workshop(s) ____ college course
____ conference workshop _____ other (please indicate)

5) Indicate which programmatic approach you think is most effective for educating language-minority students.
____ regular classes only ____ regular classes and an ESL class
____ bilingual education ____ other (please indicate)

6) I _____ working with language-minority students
a) enjoy b) don't mind c) dislike d) other (please indicate)

7) Please describe one instructional strategy or activity that you have found works well with language-minority students.

8) Would you be willing to be interviewed?
____ yes ____ no
If so, please write your name, address, and telephone number in the space below. If you think you might like to participate further in this study, but have questions please call Nancy Clair (212) 677-9606. Once again, thanks so much.

Appendix C Questionnaire: Interviews 1 through 4

Personal and Professional Background

1) Tell me about yourself. (Probe: family, schooling)

2) Describe your teaching background. (Probe: teacher education,past experiences that have influenced decision to teach, future intentions)

3) Why did you choose teaching?

Current Teaching Context

4) Describe the school in which you are now working. (Probe: size, population, ethnic background, staff, atmosphere, support)

5) Take me on a grand tour from the moment you start your day until you leave. (Probe: physical set-up of class, kinds of instructional activities students are engaged in, challenges, frustrations, emotions)

6) Describe the students in your class (Probe: abilities, likes, dislikes, disabilities, specific challenges, progress)

7) Do any students stand out for one reason or another? Why? Describe them. (Probe: academic or artistic ability, personality, peer interaction, behavior)

8) What kinds of students are easiest to teach? (Probe: rich kids, poor kids, bright kids, student types)

9) Take me on another grand tour, but this time from your students' perspectives. In other words, imagine you are a student in your class. What would a typical day be like? (Probe: instructional strategies, opportunity to interact with teacher, peers, atmosphere)

10) How do you plan lessons, activities? (Probe: when, restrictions, curriculum concerns, factors that influence the planning process)

Language-Minority Students

11) Do you have any language-minority students in your class? How many? Describe them. (Probe: native language, origin, participation, peer relationship, abilities, family, discipline, behavior)

12) Are the language-minority students in your class all day? (Probe: programmatic approach used by school, goals of approach, opinion as to effectiveness of school's approach, ideal approach, informants' definitions and understanding of the terms, bilingual, ESL, submersion, pullout)

13) How do you think the other students feel about having language-minority students in the class?

14) Are there any incidents that stand out that involved a language-minority student? Describe the incident.

15) Is there anything challenging about working with language-minority students? Describe. Why is this aspect(s) challenging?

16) What's the most difficult aspect of the English language language-minority students? Why?

Self-Reported Instructional Strategies

17) You described some of the activities that you and your students are involved in during the day. (Repeat them for clarification) Do these activities work with language-minority students? How do you know?

18) How do you know when a language-minority student understands an aspect of a lesson? directions? informal talk? When a language-minority student does not seem to understand, what do you think accounts for the misunderstanding? How do you respond?

19) Does having a language-minority student in your classroom affect your planning? If so, how?

20) From your experience are there any subjects that are easier/difficult to teach language-minority students? Which one(s)? Why?

21) Vignettes - How might you explain the behavior of language-minority students in the following situations? How might you respond? Why? (Probe: aspect of language, influence of students' native language, culture, teaching strategy, classroom atmosphere, peers)

a) It is January and Juan Carlos has not said a word in your class. When you call on him he just looks down at his paper. He is barely passing his subjects.

b) Pornwassa is enthusiastic about school. She tries to participate; however, her pronunciation makes it difficult for you and the other students to understand. Everyone seems frustrated.

22) What do language-minority students need to know in order to succeed in your classroom? Why? Where and how do they acquire these skills?

Professional Development and Support

23) What support is available to you in the education of language-minority students? (Probe: materials, ESL teachers, administration, parents, training)

24) If you could have anything available that would increase your effectiveness with language-minority students what would it be? Probe: materials, training, support, information, techniques)

25) What kinds of materials are available to you in teaching language-minority students? Are they effective? Why? If the budget were not a problem, what materials would you request?

26) Do you think there are any skills and knowledge teachers need in order to educate language-minority students? If so, what are they? Where and how can one acquire these skills and knowledge?

27) What kind of training have you had in working with language-minority students? Was the training effective? Why/Why not? (Probe: pre-service, in-service, college courses, workshops, etc.)

28) Imagine you are responsible for designing and implementing pre-service and inservice training for teachers who have language-minority students in their class. What would you include in the training? (Probe: rationale for choices, essential skills and knowledge)

29) Describe how you feel working with language-minority students? (Probe: prepared, confident, anxious, energized)

30) Who do you think should be responsible for the education of language-minority students? (Probe: ESL teacher, parents, administration)

Appendix D Questionnaire: Interview 5

The following questions were asked to all three teacher informants.

31) After reading your case history is there anything that you want to clarify?

32) Clarification. You mentioned that you have never observed the ESL/bilingual classes in your school, yet you have opinions of their effectiveness. What is the basis of your opinions?

33) What does it mean to be proficient or competent in a language? How does one become proficient or competent in a second language?

The following question includes an example for each teacher informant.

34) Throughout the interviews you mention that certain behaviors are cultural. For example: (a) Latino girls mature faster than other students (Anita); (b) Small talk is something that language-minority students aren't used to because of their culture (Joshua); (c) Asian parents wouldn't speak during parent conferences because of the notion that the teacher is always correct, the authority (Laura). How do you know that these behaviors are cultural?

Appendix E Interview Questions as Related to Research Questions

The three research questions which provide the framework for this study deal with the mainstream teachers' beliefs, self-reported practices and professional development needs. The following is an analysis of the interview questions as related to the research questions.

Research Question One - Beliefs

What are the mainstream teachers' beliefs about language-minority students in the regular classroom?

Interview Questions - 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 22, 26, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34
Total - 17

Research Question Two - Self-Reported Instructional Practices

What educational practices do the mainstream teachers say they use with language-minority students and how do they rationalize their choices?

Interview Questions - 5, 10, 17, 18, 19, 20, 26, 31,
Total - 8

Research Question Three - Professional Development and Support

How do the mainstream teachers perceive their professional development needs, roles and responsibilities in the education of language-minority students?

Interview Questions - 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31
Total - 7

Background

Interview Questions - 1, 2, 3, 4, 31
Total - 5

Appendix F Consent Form

You have agreed to participate in a dissertation study entitled Beliefs, Self-Reported Practices and Professional Development Needs of Three Classroom Teachers with Language-Minority Students. The purpose of this study is to explore and describe the mainstream teachers' points of view as they share in the education of the increasing number of language-minority students in the regular classroom. Illuminating the mainstream teachers' perspectives and challenges will provide needed information to educators committed to providing quality education for all students.

Over a five-month period, you will be interviewed, observed in the classroom and asked to keep a journal. Interviews and observations will be arranged at mutually convenient times. The final report will consist of teacher profiles based on the interviews, observations and journals. All data and references to schools, students and colleagues will be confidential. All questions concerning any aspect of the study will be answered at any point and you are free to withdraw consent anytime. The results will be available to you at the end of the study.

Your signature indicates agreement to cooperate and participate in this study.

Researcher _____

Participant _____

Date _____